DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

774.00/79

SEE 767.68/708 FOR #238

FROM Turkey (Skinner) DATED May 10, 1934

TO NAME 1—1127

REGARDING:

Bulgarian concern over visit of General Condylis, Greek Minister of War, to Turkey, and belief that the "secret clauses" of the Balkan Pact are aimed against Bulgaria. Closing of the Straits of the Dardanelles in time of war would close the Bulgarian outlet to the Aegean and isolate her.

Wi

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 867.9111/429 FOR #549

FROM Turkey (Skinner) DATED Feb. 13,1935

TO NAME 1—1127

REGARDING: Bulgarian foreign policy.
Quotes appeal from CUMHURIYET to Bulgaria to decide which combination she wishes to join, - Balkan Entente or some bombination beyond the Balkans.

lec

774.00/80

In the COMMUNIQUE we read an appeal to Bulgaria to decide which combination she wishes to join, that is to say, the Balkan Entente or some combination beyond the Balkans:

774.00

> "If Bulgaria desires friendship beyond the Balkans without doubt there exist doors at which she might call. We do not wish to say more under this head; and as we have no right to mix ourselves in the affairs of others, we should not absolutely object if Bulgaria made tentative movements in another direction. However, it must not be forgotten that the world is trying to consolidate peace, and to fortify probabilities susceptible of putting this peace in peril would not be to the profit of anybody."

In

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 874.00/524 FOR note

FROM Bulgarian Legation ( ) DATED Apr.24, 1935

TO NAME

1—1127

REGARDING:

Foreign policy of the new Government.

The - will be one of peace, understanding and cooperation between nations.

Wi

774.00/81

18

NE

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 219 Sofia, February 24, 1936.

Subject: Return of King Boris and discussion of Bulgaria's adherence to Balkan Pact.

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1936 MAR 20 PM 12 39
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

FOR DISTRIBUTION - CHECK Yes No
To the Field
In U. S. A

774.00
note
874.001 B64
740.0011 Mutual Guarantee
Balkan
760H.74

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
MAR 21 1936
DIVISION OF
NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to report that King Boris returned to Sofia the evening of February 19, returning from London, having stopped in Paris, Germany and Belgrade.

His Majesty's discussions in Paris as well as his visit to Belgrade were followed with much interest here, the local newspapers reproducing at length the accounts in the foreign press. Much satisfaction was occasioned by the generally cordial tone of the comments on the Bulgarian ruler and his people and the

rôle....

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
A-CAC
MAR 26 1936
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

774.00/82
FILED
MAR 28 1936

rôle Bulgaria has played and will play in southeastern Europe. The King's declaration of Bulgaria's loyalty to the League of Nations was unanimously approved but the question of Bulgarian adherence to the Balkan Pact, which was broached in Paris, occasioned discussion here. On February 5 there appeared in MIR an article by Mr. Mihail Madjaroff, former Minister, advocating the adherence of Bulgaria to the Pact, criticizing the policy which led Bulgaria to refuse to join and urging the King to take the present opportunity to do so. A
1/ translation of Mr. Madjaroff's article is enclosed.

A few days later Mr. Nicholas Mooshanoff, former Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs at the time the Pact was signed, replied to Mr. Madjaroff in the columns of ZORA as did Mr. Athanase Bouroff in MIR and Mr. Chr. Silianoff in SLOVO. Mr. Bouroff was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Liaptcheff Government and Mr. Silianoff is a former deputy and well-known journalist. Translations of the statements of Messrs.
2/3/4 Mooshanoff, Bouroff and Silianoff are also enclosed and it may be added that they certainly represent the opinion of the vast majority of Bulgarians. It is most improbable that Bulgaria will ever adhere to the Balkan Pact, at least in its present form.

In connection with the King's visit to Belgrade it was remarked here that while it was at first announced as being purely private, it soon developed into a state occasion, His Majesty leaving the Yugoslav capital on a special.....

760 H.74

special train with the Royal Family and all the Government at the station and full military honors being rendered. Undoubtedly the King seized the opportunity his journey offered to stop in Belgrade and to attempt to revivify the Bulgarian-Yugoslav rapprochement initiated by him and the late King Alexander but which noticeably cooled after the advent of the Tosheff Government and the suggestion made, at the time of its discovery, of the complicity of the Yugoslav Government in the Veltcheff plot.

On February 23, in the course of an interview with representatives of the press, Mr. Kiosseivanoff made the following statement:

> "His Majesty the King left for London to pay a last tribute to King George who had more than once manifested toward him feelings of sincere friendship and sympathy. The King utilized this opportunity personally to inform himself on the general international situation.
>
> "In the conversations which he had with prominent politicians, His Majesty had the opportunity to explain the foreign policy of Bulgaria and to dispel certain misunderstandings of the internal policy of the country.
>
> "We must note with satisfaction that His Majesty found everywhere approval of the pacific policy of Bulgaria. We all must be pleased and gratified that the King was accorded everywhere a warm and cordial reception, particularly in Belgrade where, as you know, the King paid homage at the grave of King Alexander with whom he initiated the policy of understanding and rapprochement between the two sister nations."

Interrogated on the question of the Balkan Pact, the Prime Minister continued:

"This.....

"This suggestion is only based on presumptions. The considerations which at the time of the signature of the Pact prevented Bulgaria from becoming a party to it have been openly and clearly stated so that there is no need to repeat them. In spite of the fact that Bulgaria is not a participant in the Pact, she adds her modest efforts to those of the other Balkan States to maintain and consolidate peace in the Balkans. Sincerely attached to the League of Nations, Bulgaria, who believes that the League's principles will triumph, will pursue a policy of peace, understanding, cooperation and friendship with all nations and, most of all, with her neighbors."

Respectfully yours,

John McArdle
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

Enclosures:
4 translations of
newspaper articles.

File 800/710
McA/MM

Copy to Belgrade

ENCLOSURE NO. 1 TO DESPATCH NO. 219,
FEBRUARY 24, 1936. AMERICAN LEGATION, SOFIA.

Translation of statement by Mr. Mihail Madjaroff published in MIR on February 5, 1936.

The most important question discussed in the long conversation of King Boris with Mr. Lebrun was that of the Balkan Pact and the possibility of Bulgaria becoming a party to it. The recommendation made to the King in the two capitals has probably been accompanied by the most serious and authoritative arguments in favor of it. Our duty is to listen to these recommendations because they are (insofar as they can be), the most disinterested and sincere. We must give our cooperation to the pacific nations in carrying out the great idea of collective security. In our present internal situation a sound foreign policy would be appreciated not only by the foreign world, but also by the Bulgarian people. If the Chief of State adopts that line of conduct, his merits will be double. Today the responsibilities of the Chief of State are heavier than ever, both for positive action and missed opportunities. Will Bulgaria ever have a better opportunity of helping humanity in its effort to establish a lasting peace ? When we are alone we represent but a small portion of the world power, but when we form part of a group we will have a significance equal to that of the entire group. The Bulgarian King cannot fail to understand the present moment and to take a happy step of rapprochement with those who are anxious to maintain peace. He has no formal reasons to excuse him for missed opportunities; neither has he any legal obstacles. In political life not only actions are criticized and judged but inaction, indecision and missed opportunities as well. Today great powers as well as small states are looking for friends and allies. We ought not be an exception, for if we are, we may have to pay a high price for it some time."

****

ENCLOSURE NO. 2 TO DESPATCH NO. 219,
FEBRUARY 24, 1936. AMERICAN LEGATION, SOFIA.

Translation of statement by Mr. Nicholas Mooshanoff published in ZORA on February 9, 1936.

We do not know the "serious and authoritative arguments" which France and England are supposed to have explained to our King, but to us they seem to belong more to the realm of fantasy than to that of reality. Moreover, Bulgaria has her own arguments to justify her point of view more weighty than the imaginary ones. In the face of an agreement representing armaments ten to fifteen times larger than those of Bulgaria, it is ridiculous to consider our country a danger for peace in the Balkans. She is, in addition, bound by her international obligations: she is a member of the League of Nations and has signed the Kellogg Pact. Great powers may take the liberty of treating international treaties as scraps of paper; small nations cannot afford such a luxury. If they disregard international treaties they are cruelly punished. Finally, in order to give full evidence of their pacific intentions, Bulgaria offered to sign pacts of non-aggression with her neighbors. No other country, a victim of the last peace treaties, has given better evidence and guarantees of its desire for peace and understanding. It is sad, therefore, to read in a Bulgarian newspaper that unless she enters into the Balkan Agreement, Bulgaria will miss its only opportunity of "helping humanity in its effort to establish a lasting peace."

The question of Bulgaria entering into the Balkan Pact was seriously discussed at the beginning of 1934. Bulgaria refused to become a party to it, and this was not done because she did not desire peace and understanding with her heighbors, but precisely because peace and understanding form the basis of her foreign policy. Peace is based on treaties; if peace is to be guaranteed, treaties must be enforced. Bulgaria has carried out all her obligations under the treaties and has the right to ask that the obligations to her should be carried out as well. A dignified understanding with our neighbors will be possible without new humiliations and without a Balkan Pact. This was the attitude of Bulgaria in the question of the Balkan Pact; her policy was a honest and open one, in keeping with the Covenant of the League of Nations. This policy, supported by local public opinion, was also approved by the leading political factors abroad. Seldom have we seen such a complete unanimity of public opinion in Bulgaria as on the question of the Balkan Pact; it was not the policy of a party or of a personality, but that of the entire people. The comments which appeared in THE TIMES and the TEMPS emphasized the dignified attitude of the Government in this question.

It is strange to hear the opinion of Mr. Madjaroff on so important an issue for the destiny of our country. But, after all, there may be differenct opinions. Mr. Madjaroff, however, would like his opinion to be that of the Chief of State. He urges him not to miss opportunities, he threatens that even inaction implies responsibilities, he thinks that it is time for

the.....

the King to take decisions now that "no formal reasons or legal obstacles" exist. This is a revolutionary idea and Mr. Madjaroff has courage to express it in the face of public opinion. The King should adopt Mr. Madjaroff's idea against the feeling of his entire people. Has Mr. Madjaroff thought of the consequences for the prestige and name of the Chief of State and the future of the country if his unfortunate views were adopted ? We are certain that they will not be.

****

ENCLOSURE NO. 3 TO DESPATCH NO. 219,
FEBRUARY 24, 1936. AMERICAN LEGATION, SOFIA.

Translation of statement by Mr. Bouroff published in MIR on February 8, 1936.

The King has probably had the opportunity to explain the attitude of Bulgaria and to dispel any suspicions as to our pacific intentions. If Bulgaria still is out of the Balkan group, this is due to the manner and to conditions under which she was invited to join. It had almost the form of an ultimatum and the comments which accompanied the invitation made of the Balkan Pact an instrument which might rather impair than improve the international situation in the Balkans; the Bulgarian Government was right in refusing to accept it in that form. A defeated and unjustly treated people cannot be expected to sign, twenty years after, another treaty which aggravates its position and implies the abandonment of the few rights, although theoretical, granted by the Peace Treaty. There is no instance in history of a defeated country requested to consent to sacrifices by a new and voluntary treaty. Let us hope that our neighbors will understand our justified feelings and will facilitate the participation of Bulgaria in the Balkan Pact by introducing in it certain modifications which would guarantee the rights Bulgaria has under the Covenant of the League of Nations and the Treaty of Neuilly. In the meantime there is another field in which Balkan solidarity could be developed: it is the field of economics. An economic cooperation might lead finally to a tariff union and would also prepare the psychological atmosphere for political cooperation. Had we started from economics, perhaps we might have arrived more easily at our goal.

****

ENCLOSURE NO. 4 TO DESPATCH NO. 219,
FEBRUARY 24, 1936. AMERICAN LEGATION, SOFIA.

Translation of statement by Mr. Chr. Silianoff published in SLOVO on February 11, 1936.

We have no other information on the conversations of the King in Paris and London but the comments of the press in the two countries. The King has been praised for his attachment to peace. No criticisms, reservations or intimations give us any reason to believe that the King's understanding regarding the system that could most efficaciously guarantee peace in Europe and the Balkans, has brought about any objections or warnings that could justify dramatic attitudes here. The TEMPS points out that there has not been in Paris any "negotiations on a concrete program", but simply an "exchange of views" that "might create favorable conditions for a broad policy of reconcilation and thus constitute a happy introduction to a joint action at the most convenient moment". We are, consequently, still in the phase of an "introduction". Bulgaria is not confronted with the necessity of taking a decision or accepting some tempting proposition which might be withdrawn if we fail to make haste. It is strange, therefore, that the invitation to take extreme decisions has come from Sofia. This, however, should not be taken tragically as it has given the occasion for a public debate which has shown that public opinion in Bulgaria does not endorse the ideas of Mr. Madjaroff. Has Bulgaria made a mistake in 1934 when she abstained from entering into the Balkan Pact ? Two Ministers of Foreign Affairs replied in the negative. Bulgaria could not join in a Pact which was initiated and prepared without her knowledge and participation, which was offered in the "form of an ultimatum" and would have led her to abandon the minimum rights recognized by the Treaty of Neuilly. It would be better to ask another question: did the leaders of Bulgarian foreign policy foresee the danger and have they in due time done all that was necessary to avert the encircling of Bulgaria ? The means to do it existed and they were the pacts of arbitration and non-aggression with all neighbors. As usual, we missed the moment when bilateral pacts could have been utilized and offered them when it was too late and after the Balkan Pact was already agreed upon. Fortunately Bulgaria succeeded in making the Pact harmless in a way by firmly adhering to her sincere attachment to the League of Nations and to her policy of loyalty with regard to her neighbors. The Pact did not prove to be a serious obstacle to the cooperation in a spirit of reconciliation and understanding between Bulgaria and the neighboring countries. Bulgaria cannot refuse to take her natural place among her Balkan neighbors provided the conditions of her adherence to the Balkan Pact are modified in her favor. All elements which give it an anti-Bulgarian tendency must be removed. Bulgaria cannot bury with her own hands the hope for a pacific revision of the Treaty of Neuilly by the conditions and in the framework fixed by the Covenant of the League of Nations. Our neighbors cannot ask it from us as it has never been asked from any other of the defeated nations. If they

desire....

desire a real and lasting agreement, not a mechanical and purely formal one, they must take the initiative and make such gestures as the moral reconciliation of the Balkan nations require. There are other important elements in this question. The Balkan Pact contains secret clauses and this is why it has not yet been registered with the League of Nations. It is not less important for Bulgaria, which is exclusively a Balkan country, to know in advance her obligations under the Pact when the latter will no longer have as its objective the "Bulgarian danger". In other words the question is far from being so simple and so easy as to encourage and even urge the King to take a quick decision by himself alone.

****

974.00

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

SEE 763.72119/12694 FOR #1095

FROM Greece (MacVeagh) DATED Mar. 17, 1936

TO NAME 1—1127

REGARDING: Denunciation of the Treaty of Neuilly by Bulgaria as a consequence of the denunciation by Germany of the Treaties of Versailles and Locarno. Statement of Mr. Chichmanoff regarding -, during which he stressed his country's military impotence without allusion to any alleged pacific or amicable intentions.

ge

774.00 /83

83

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
RECEIVED
JUN 19 1936
DIVISION OF
COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

JUN 15 1936
6-3
2657-V-762

G-2 Report 3820

BULGARIA (Political)

Subject: Principal Foreign Policies.
Bulgaria's Foreign Policies.

On Saturday, May 9th, I was received by King Boris to pay my farewell visit. After some preliminary conversation he asked me what the present feeling in Turkey was concerning Bulgaria. I replied that at the time of my departure from Turkey, a week previous, the feeling appeared to be more friendly than it had during the four years which I have been in Turkey; that after the Germans had moved into the Rhineland all the Turks were asking whether Bulgaria would also denounce the Treaty of Neuilly; that Dr. Aras, the Turkish Foreign Minister, had on several occasions, and with great publicity, announced that Bulgaria would not do anything that was not correct; that he had absolute confidence in Bulgaria's good intentions; and that this comment by Dr. Aras had had considerable effect on public sentiment. His Majesty then said that he was very glad to hear me say this; that he and Mr. Kossievanoff, the Bulgarian Prime Minister, had had several talks with Dr. Aras; and that he was happy to hear that these talks had been taken as being in good faith.

He then talked at some length on his aspirations for Bulgaria. The conversation was in English. While His Majesty speaks English very well, he uses some peculiar expressions. He said: "During my epoch I wish only for peace and an opportunity to better the economic condition of Bulgaria. For the present we must forget all ideas of any change in the frontiers of Bulgaria. We must convince our neighbors that we have no desire at present or during my epoch to change these frontiers. What may come fifty or hundred years from now I do not know, but I hope that my epoch will go down in history as a time when Bulgaria was at peace with all her neighbors and devoted herself entirely to internal economic progress."

Later, in talking of the Bulgarian army, he said: "We must change the spirit of our army somewhat. It is too aggressive. We must imbue our soldiers and officers with the idea that we are maintaining an army solely for the defense of Bulgaria and to protect ourselves from any invasion by our neighbors, but not for any purpose of aggression against them."

He then returned to the subject of Bulgarian-Turkish relations and said "Mouchanoff (the last Constitutional Prime Minister) handled the Turkish situation very badly. He went to Ankara and opened negotiations with the Turks and then invited them to Sofia where much was made of them, and then suddenly dropped them. This naturally infuriated the Turks and, as you know, in 1933 and 1934 our relations were very bad. Ever since then I have tried to improve them and convince them that we

774.00/84

From: M.A. Istanbul Report No. 6630 May 18, 1936.

have no aggressive intentions. We must take Bulgaria, just that Bulgaria which has been left to us under the treaty, and make the best of it that we can."

During this conversation His Majesty asked me regarding my own future movements. He was interested in learning that our General Staff was not permanent and that officers were detailed to it only four years at a time and must then return to duty with their branch. He said: "That is an excellent idea. We must arrange something of that sort in our army. If we had had that we would not have had the fiascos that we have had in the past few years." This referred to the numerous changes of government, or attempts at change of government, that have been engineered either in whole or in part by the army.

As usual His Majesty expressed the greatest admiration for the United States and said "if it had not been for Admiral Bristol, Mr. Murphy and the group of Americans at Samokov, Bulgaria would have ceased as an independent country." He has referred to this matter on several occasions and is always most earnest in his regard for our country and for those individuals mentioned.

This conversation lasted one and a half hours, at the end of which time King Boris presented me with a signed and framed photograph of himself, some smaller pictures of himself in conversation with me during the review on May 6th, and also handed me a box containing the Cross of a Commander of the Order of Military Merit, saying: "I know that you are not supposed to receive this officially, but I want you to take this as a personal present from me as a souvenir of your four years here."

J. A. CRANE,
Lt.Colonel, Field Artillery,
Military Attache.

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

774.00/85

SEE 874.00/552 FOR #233

FROM Bulgaria (Sterling) DATED June 1, 1936

TO NAME

1—1127

REGARDING: Conversation with the Foreign Minister concerning Bulgarian external affairs in which the Minister stated that Bulgaria would not take unilateral action in breaking treaties and would not request revision of the Treaty of Neuilly. Question of outlet to the Agean will not be brought up at present.

Wi

King's personal
antipathy to war.
Respect for force.
Yugoslav. ..
through ring
More credence in
G. than I. (situation
unaltered
French prestige
Personal policy.
Anglo-B.
Cond. cleverer & far sighted

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

November 22, 1937.

Summary of Despatch No. 7,
from Legation at Sofia,
dated November 2, 1937.

Subject: The Bulgarian Political Situation

Mr. Atherton has presented his impressions of the political situation in Bulgaria. In his audience with the King, the latter stressed his single aim of maintaining peace for his country and his personal antipathy for war. The King's approach to the maintenance of peace, however, does not mean that Bulgaria acquiesces in its present territorial frontiers which are considered unjust.

It is thought that the entente with Yugoslavia is looked on with considerable satisfaction as it represents a breaking through the ring of powers allied against Bulgaria in the Great War.

In connection with Bulgarian feeling towards the dictatorship countries, Mr. Atherton finds that more ~~credence~~ belief is placed in the final achievements of Hitler than of Mussolini; but this may be a result of the unsatisfactory commercial relations which exist between Bulgaria and Italy.

It

It is now impossible for Bulgaria to collect monies due for commodities supplied by her to Italy; and in general there is a feeling in Sofia that Italy has shown no understanding of the country's problems. French prestige is not at a very high level due to the internal situation in France. However, the personal policy of King Boris is to fortify Anglo-Bulgarian relations, and Mr. Atherton feels that in his conversations in London he would have disavowed any leanings toward the Rome-Berlin axis.

In conclusion, Mr. Atherton has gained the impression that King Boris is a cleverer and more far-sighted politician and statesman than perhaps any man in his country. His position at the moment is strong because of the return to a parliamentary regime, the birth of a son and heir, and Bulgaria's improved economic situation.

R. D. Coe

Eu:RDC:DG

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 7 Sofia, November 2, 1937.

Subject: Survey based on observations and discussions since arrival of Minister.

Copy in Eu
DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
NOV 17 1937
File Cor
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

OFFICE OF THE ADVISER ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AFFAIRS
DEC 6 - 1937
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

1937 NOV 16 PM 2 11
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

CONFIDENTIAL

Rating
Grade for
Distribution Instructions
MID
ONI
confidential

774.00/86

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
A-M/C
NOV 2 9 1937
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

NOV 30 1937

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
NOV 26 1937
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

TREATY DIVISION
File Enc
DEC 2 - 1937
C/B
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to set forth a brief survey based on my preliminary observations and discussions since my arrival in Sofia. In presenting my letter of credence to the King, he stressed in the course of his informal remarks to me which followed that his single aim was to achieve and maintain peace for his country. He added "we were caught taking sides in the world war -- and on the losing side -- we have paid for our experience...

FP
FILED
DEC 7 1937

experience and our aim will be to avoid entanglements in any future struggle." In his subsequent remarks to the Military Attaché he stated as follows:

> "We want this country to have a feeling of surety. I know what war means. I know from personal experience what Bulgaria has suffered in the past. So we are interested in peace. Not merely peace in the abstract, actual peace. We want no war, not only none in this country nor in eastern Europe. We want none anywhere. We're striving to avoid any sort of entanglements, and the only means to that end is by keeping on the best of relations with all."

I believe these statements of the King to represent the general Bulgarian viewpoint and one which guided him in deciding upon a foreign policy which in his judgment held out the greatest promise of peace, but which at the same time did not lend any interpretation of acquiescence to Bulgaria's present territorial frontiers which are considered unjust. The recent understanding with Yugoslavia is the natural outcome, and I should expect would be the extent of any definite commitment in foreign policy Bulgaria will undertake for the present future. The traditions of this country are in the main founded on force and there is a wholesome respect for nations that uphold that tradition. Thus, the entente with Yugoslavia, in spite of the Macedonian question and in spite of undefined apprehension here lest Yugoslavia might become the tutelary power, has been generally accepted in this country for want of any better alternative, especially as this understanding with a strong Slav neighbor has broken through the ring of powers

allied....

allied in the war that surrounded this country and has brought Bulgaria into a stronger position vis-à-vis Greece and Rumania. While events in the dictator countries are being closely followed, I find less belief here as to the final achievement of Italy under Mussolini than there is in the future of Germany, and it is interesting to note that at the recent army manoeuvres Yugoslavia and Germany were the only two countries invited to send a military mission.

I have not yet been able to discover that either the Soviets or the great democratic countries of Europe (I refer specially to France and England) have that eminence here that I expected. French prestige has suffered considerably in the Balkan countries lately due to the French internal situation, and the general Franco-British policy towards the Balkans is regarded in Sofia as being but corollary to their policies as determined by the general European situation confronting them. The position of the Balkan countries in the matter of sanctions against Italy is frequently cited in this connection. Nevertheless, I believe it correct that given the apparent solidarity of purpose of these two democratic countries at the recent Nyon Conference, the French and British representatives took that occasion to discuss the general Balkan situation with the representatives of those Balkan countries attending, and while the Bulgarian Prime Minister, Mr. Kiosseivanoff, welcomed the opportunity given to him personally and spoke without reserve as to the peaceful aims of his

Government.....

Government, it was not until the recent electoral law was passed by the Council of Ministers (see Legation's despatch No. 5, October 26) assuring an early return to limited democratic institutions in this country, that King Boris was able to satisfy his personal policy in seeking to fortify Anglo-Bulgarian relations and to reinforce Mr. Kiosseivanoff's remarks by conversations in London. On this occasion he undoubtedly will also disavow any Bulgarian leanings towards the Rome-Berlin axis. King Boris's recent presence in London was well received and in this connection I venture to quote from the TIMES' leader of November 1st:

> "London has very welcome guests in King Boris and Queen Ioanna of Bulgaria, who arrived in this country yesterday and will remain here during the week. Unofficial though their visit is, it is a matter of importance that a Sovereign of high character and swift as well as solid intelligence should be visiting this country during the present anxious period in the fortunes of Europe. Apart from his personal reasons for liking London, among which are his kinship to our Royal Family and his wide range of interests, King Boris has never lost a chance of enlarging his circle of personal contacts with foreign statesmen and high officials and of studying the policies of foreign Governments. Previous journeys to London, Paris, Rome, and Berlin have enabled him to serve his country's cause in many ways, and not least by correcting misapprehensions of Bulgarian policy and by dispelling misunderstandings. Two fortunate events, which have happened this year, have greatly strengthened his own position, and have unquestionably consolidated the internal situation of his country. The birth of a son and heir, welcomed with immense enthusiasm by his people, is one of them. The other is his success in bringing Bulgaria back to the threshold

of....

of democracy, after over three years of a more or less dictatorial régime which was originally imposed upon his country and upon him by a military clique.*

King Boris's present journey to London, which permits carrying further the conversations begun will, it is understood here, also include Paris and Rome. There is much speculation here as to what his decision will be in regard to a visit to Berlin.

This Legation has already reported on the trade position with Germany, but I am informed Bulgaria's indebtedness today for goods supplied from Germany, specially war materials (the bills for which in many cases, however, have not yet matured), is as a matter of fact at a record figure. From the Bulgarian viewpoint the situation vis-à-vis Italy is unsatisfactory, since it has been impossible to collect monies due for commodities supplied by this country. On my journey here I found in Hungary the same situation as regards Italy. For Hungary there have been compensating political advantages, but in Bulgaria there is the feeling that Italy has shown no understanding of the country's problems. In this general connection I have been informed that in spite of British official statements reported here in favor of a general policy for the removal of restrictions on the freedom of trade, British Board of Trade officials throughout the past year in their conversations with Bulgarian representatives have urged that the trade figures between the two countries should be more nearly balanced.

662.7431

For the....

For the past three years Bulgaria has had a succession of good crops and the increase in world commodity prices, notably since 1935, has correspondingly benefited Bulgaria, and this recovery is reflected also in the country's foreign reserves. Well-considered opinion here considers that this favorable situation may wane, either as a result of a decline in the agricultural markets, or of a crop deficiency, which the country experiences periodically. Unfortunately Bulgaria has few other resources.

It may also be of interest to note in connection with this despatch that subsequent to the Nyon Conference Mr. Stoyadinovitch, Prime Minister of Yugoslavia, has also made a pilgrimage to France and London which resulted in the renewing of the pact of Franco-Yugoslavian accord. The King of Greece is now reported to be on his way through Italy to London. In Hungary it was definitely stated to me the importance which was attached to the Nyon conversations, since it offered an opportunity to explain the country's position to the western democracies. These Balkan visits likewise indicate the same preoccupation.

There is borne in upon one here a strong impression that King Boris is a cleverer and a more far-sighted politician and statesman than perhaps any man in his country, and if the forthcoming election return a parliament to ratify his acts since 1934, his position, at this instant he has chosen to return to a parliamentary régime, fortified by a birth of a son and heir, by the country's improved economic situation,

and....

and by those personal and friendly contacts he is able to maintain with foreign governments, will be stronger than ever.

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

File 800
RA/MM

(1 copy used for note)

4 carbon copies

Received 7 P

DCR

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Memorandum of Conversation

3
RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1937 NOV 27 AM 9 34
DIVISION OF
COMMUNICATIONS
AND RECORDS

DATE: November 26, 1937.

SUBJECT: U. S. Foreign Policy.

PARTICIPANTS: SECRETARY OF STATE HULL AND THE BULGARIAN MINISTER, MR. DIMITRI NAOUMOFF.

COPIES TO: U, A-W, NE, PR

774.00

774.00/87

GPO 1—1493

The Minister of Bulgaria came in to pay his respects after a visit to his home abroad. He proceeded to extend greetings of good will and good wishes from the Foreign Minister of his Government.

The Minister then said that the relations of his country with the surrounding nations were thoroughly friendly; that his country also was enjoying increasingly desirable trade and commercial relations with them. He referred with interest to our proposed trade agreement with Great Britain and to our reciprocity policy as offering very great help towards composing the world situation politically, economically and peaceably. I expressed

G-J

FILED
NOV 26 1937

expressed my gratification in each instance and added that we were continuing to strive for the progress of our program which is the spearhead of a seven or eight point program intended for economic restoration, more permanent exchange and monetary arrangements, debt payments, limitation and reduction of armaments, recommitments to international law, non-intervention, support of the sanctity of treaties, and peaceful settlement of controversies.

During the conversation, I congratulated the Minister upon his recent marriage.

C.H.

S CH:HR

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

January 10, 1938.

774.00/88

Summary of Despatch No. 21 from Legation at Sofia, December 16, 1937.

Subject: Bulgaria and the Balkan Pact.

In discussing with the British Minister in Sofia the visit of King Boris to London, Mr. Atherton states that the Minister declared that the main object of the King's visit was to establish himself in French and English opinion as a democratic, constitutional Monarch, and to explain that Bulgaria was in no way liable to attach itself to the Rome-Berlin axis. Furthermore the King was prepared, if the question of Bulgarian armament was broached, to explain that it is of a very modest nature and is in reality a reorganization program.

The British Minister expanded on the subject of Bulgarian relations with the surrounding Balkan countries and he is of the opinion that Greece is the "nigger in the woodpile" so far as an understanding between Bulgaria and its neighbors

is

is concerned. (However there is not a great deal of love lost between the Bulgarians and the Turks.) The efforts of Turkey and Rumania to improve their relations through better treatment of minorities was scuppered by the Greeks who brought the question up at both Ankara and Bucharest. Once again the Greeks injected themselves into the picture, regarding Bulgarian rearmament and were able to obtain Turkish and Rumanian support against Bulgaria's desire for two small submarines to be stationed on her Black Sea coast.

In relation to Yugoslavia, Mr. Atherton reports that very little has been accomplished as a result of the pact of friendship beyond the fact that the frontier has been opened. The Yugoslav Minister in Sofia admits a paucity of concrete results, but suggests that Stoyadinovitch has been very much occupied with European politics. The Minister is hopeful that more attention can be given to Bulgarian-Yugoslav relations.

It seems unlikely that Bulgaria would attempt to join the Balkan Pact until the minor annoyances with her neighbors could be disposed of -- attempts to solve these questions as at

present

present-through diplomatic channels, would be replaced by a raising of these vexing problems in discussions of the Balkan Pact where Bulgaria would at once find herself in a minority position.

The British Minister feels that a discontented Bulgaria, thwarted in her legitimate aspirations, is a greater uncertainty in the Balkan situation than a country that is allowed to carry on within a modest program. Prime Minister Kiosseivanoff approached him on the subject of the submarines and he advised his Government accordingly and understood that the matter will be raised by the British missions at Athens, Ankara and Paris. The British Minister agreed that Bulgaria's fundamental policy is based on a maintenance of peace in the Balkans. He feels, however, that Greece's nervousness results from uncordial relations existing between Italy and England. (In this connection it should be recalled that the hostility towards Bulgaria on all sides is more bitter on the part of Greece than from any other country, with the possible exception of Turkey.)

Eu:Coe:AMR.

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 21 Sofia, December 16, 1937.

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1937 DEC 29 PM 1 04
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

Subject: Bulgaria and the Balkan Pact.

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
DEC 31 1937
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

774.00/88

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	M.I.D. ONI

JAN 13 1938

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
JAN 11 1938
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
JAN 14 1938
DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
A-M/C
JAN 10 1938
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

I have the honor to refer to my despatch No. 7, of November 2, 1937, and to state that I enquired of my British colleague as to what he had heard from his Government concerning the conversations that took place with King Boris during the latter's visit to London. The British Minister replied he had been informed as to the King's talks both in Paris and London and that they were in themselves not important, the main...

741.74

JAN 17 1938
CONFIDENTIAL FILE
FILED

GML

874.001
762.65
874.20

main object of the King's visit being to establish himself in French and English opinion as a democratic, constitutional Monarch, and explain that Bulgaria was in no way liable to be drawn into the purlieu of the Rome-Berlin axis. Furthermore, the King was prepared, if the question of Bulgarian armament policy was broached to him, to explain that the present so-called rearmament was in reality a reorganization program which was modest in its very nature, especially compared with the programs of neighboring Balkan countries. I then referred to the cordial reception given to King Boris in London and especially to the TIMES' editorial quoted in my despatch above referred to. The British Minister explained to me the background upon which he believed much of the Foreign Office's cordiality to the King was based. In the early part of the present year the British Minister had reported to his Government his belief in a tentative Bulgarian desire to improve within limits its relations with the surrounding Balkan countries. There was no problem that prevented somewhat improved relations with Turkey and as to Rumania, through the good offices of the present Rumanian Minister in Sofia, conversations were begun as to the treatment of peasant minorities, schools and the establishment of better communications, more especially an adequate ferry for automobiles, etc. across the Danube at the Bulgarian-Rumanian frontier at Rousse (see Legation's despatch No. 409, July 26, 1937). At the turn of the year the

conversations...

conversations with Yugoslavia resulted in the Bulgarian-Yugoslav pact of friendship. According to my British colleague, the Greeks from the beginning were very much perturbed at this trend of Bulgarian policy and according to his information, brought the question up for discussion in Ankara and Bucharest, with the result that the Rumanian Government ceased discussions as to the question of peasant minorities and some time in the summer the charters were cancelled for four Bulgarian schools which existed among the Bulgarian minorities in Rumania. Prime Minister Kiosseivanoff, I know, has expressed to others of my colleagues regret at this measure taken by the Rumanian Government and pointed out the pressure that was being brought on him to close the Rumanian school in Bulgaria, which he felt that if he were forced to do might further alienate sympathy between Sofia and Bucharest. However, conversation for improved communications has continued and my Rumanian colleague informed me last night that the contract for the construction of a new ferry by a German firm was signed yesterday

871.4016

At the conference of the Balkan ~~Entente~~ pact held this autumn under Turkish initiative, according to my British colleague, the Greeks again brought up the question of Bulgarian rearmament and were able to obtain Turkish and Rumanian support against Bulgaria's desire for two small submarines to be stationed on her Black Sea coast. The opposition was sufficient so that up to the present time at any rate Bulgaria has not placed the order for these

two....

two submarines in France as had apparently been her intention. My English colleague pointed out that according to the estimate of the British Military Attaché, if one evaluated the sum spent on military improvements in this country during the past year, including work by soldier labor in ground leveling, etc. etc., the total sum does not exceed 25 million dollars, which the British Military Attaché considers a modest figure in view of the rearmament programs of the surrounding countries. He cited that last year Turkey had completed a fifty-million dollar rearmament program and was now engaged in a two-year program calling for an expenditure of another 50 million dollars. Greek rearmament plans were also extensive.

Behind the façade of the Bulgarian-Yugoslav pact of friendship I learn from my conversations here that very little has been accomplished beyond the fact that the frontier had been opened, but even in this connection many petty annoyances have been retained. My Yugoslav colleague here admits that to date the concrete results of the pact have not been great, but made the suggestion that Prime Minister Stoyadinovitch had during the past year been very much engaged in European politics and that he was hopeful in the future more attention could be given to Bulgarian-Yugoslav relations. Thus, according to the views of my British colleague, which I understand he has in the past twelve months conveyed to his Government, Greece is "the nigger in the woodpile" that has

made...

760h.74

made the position of the Bulgarian Government in its desire for more cordial relations more difficult.

In my conversations with Bulgarians during the weeks I have been here as to their attitude vis-à-vis the Balkan Pact, a very general explanation has been given to me that it is useless for them to attempt to join the Balkan ~~Entente~~ Pact until the ever-recurring questions of minor annoyances between Bulgaria and her neighbors have been disposed of; it would mean that instead of an attempt to solve these questions through diplomatic channels, as was the case at present, these annoyances and vexing problems would be raised with no greater goodwill in discussions of the Balkan ~~Entente~~ Pact where Bulgaria would at once find herself in a minority position.

740.0011 M.D. (Balkans)

Summing up the whole picture, the British Minister informed me that he had advised his Government that he felt a discontented Bulgaria, thwarted in what might be defended as legitimate aspirations, was a greater uncertainty in the Balkan situation than a country that was allowed to carry on within a modest program and, accordingly, when Prime Minister Kiosseivanoff had approached him and indirectly pointed out that Bulgaria's perfectly legitimate wish for two submarines was being blocked, he had advised his Government accordingly and understood at the present time that this matter might be raised by the British representatives in Athens, Ankara as well as in Paris. Furthermore, the British Minister was hopeful that Monsieur

Delbos.....

Delbos might decide to pay a visit to Sofia shortly after the conclusion of his round of visits to the neighboring capitals.

The British Minister is in agreement with me that there is every evidence here that Bulgaria's fundamental policy is based on a maintenance of peace in the Balkans. He feels, however, that much of Greek nervousness as to intentions of this country is based on the uncordial relations existing between Italy and England and apprehension lest if there were war in the Mediterranean Bulgaria might attempt to gain through threats or through force an outlet on the Aegean.

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

File 710
RA/MM

4 Carbon Copies
Received 7-10

1 copy destroyed
1-17-38
DCR: MP

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
JUL 27 1938
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 111

Sofia, July 11, 1938.

Subject: Prime Minister's Speech on Foreign and Domestic Policy.

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1938 JUL 26 PM 1 32
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AUG 4 1938
DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AUG 1 1938
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

774.00

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to transmit, in quintuplicate, a translation of the speech made by the Prime Minister, Mr. Kiosseivanoff, before the Sobranjé (Parliament) on July 7, 1938, in defense of the Speech from the Throne (see despatch No. 85 of May 25, 1938). In his speech the Prime Minister refers to the events preceding and during his term of office which led to the return of a parliamentary form of government.

The Prime Minister's comments regarding the foreign

774.032/57

FILED
AUG - 5 1938

774.00/89

GML

foreign policy of Bulgaria are particularly important as they constitute the first public pronouncement as to policy, both internal and external, that has been made for some time. In view of recent events his statement that he rejects with indignation the persistent rumours that the commercial exchange with certain countries (implying Germany) is founded upon political agreements, is especially significant.

With regard to the League of Nations he stated that despite certain events which have seriously affected the prestige of the League, Bulgaria remains attached to it and that he still sees in the League a hope for small and weak nations.

He stressed the cordial relations now existing between Bulgaria and Yougoslavia and pointed out the improvement in Bulgaria's relations with Turkey, Rumania and Greece. As to the Balkan Pact he remarked that the reasons which prevented Bulgaria joining the Pact at its inception still existed, however, bonds of understanding and cooperation which are not opposed to the interests of Bulgaria have been established with the countries forming the Pact.

The Prime Minister's speech has been extremely well received in Bulgaria and favorably commented on in the press of neighboring countries, particularly in Rumania and Yougoslavia.

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

File No.800
KGM/RWH

Enclosure:
Translation of Prime Minister's speech.

Copies to: Athens, Belgrad,
Bucarest, Istanbul.

Enclosure No. 1
to despatch No.111,
dated July 11, 1938,
American Legation,
Sofia, Bulgaria.

PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH.

In the course of the discussions held here on the reply to the Speech from the Throne, you have had the opportunity of hearing a detailed criticism of the domestic, foreign and economic policy of the Government during the last two and half years.

To criticize the policy of the Government such as it is formulated in the Speech from the Throne is one of the rights of the representatives of the people, a right which, I regret to mention, some of the deputies have neglected to make use.

In order that this criticism be useful, it must be dictated exclusively by the interests of the nation and of the state.

When the activity of a Government is being criticized, the circumstances under which it was called upon to govern and the possibilities which it had at that time and later, must be taken into consideration.

You remember the days of anxiety and even danger for our state, when my friends and myself were called upon to preside over the destinies of this country.

At that time, His Majesty the King addressed us the following instructive words, which have become the program of the Cabinets formed since November 23, 1935 up to now - "You will direct all your efforts to establish a lasting internal and external peace, to redress public finances, to contribute to the economic recovery of the country and to assist the needy population."

This program of constructive government has been developped in detail in the Cabinet's declaration made public three days after its formation in November 1935. For this reason, the allusions made by some deputies that the Cabinet governs without a definite program, are purely arbitrary.

I mentioned a while ago the Chief of State in order to emphazize - a fact known by all - his great and unceasing preoccupation with the lot of this country and with its pacific and quiet development, and not, as a deputy from whom I never expected such remarks, attempted to intimate, in order to make the King responsible, even indirectly, for the activities of the Government, and to thus place certain responsibilities of the Government where they must not be.

I wish to protest most categorically and with indignation against such an accusation, and to declare before you and before the Bulgarian people, in my name and in the name of my colleagues of yesterday and today, that we, who have governed and govern, we alone carry all the responsibility of our government, of what we have done or have omitted to do. We do not avoid nor try to divide this responsibility with others. I would say that we are proud of it.

It is with this feeling and consciousness of its responsibilities that the Government presents itself before you, the highest tribunal of the Bulgarian people, with its achievements, good or bad.

When we came to power we were not, and neither are we today "experienced politicians. We do not think, however, that this is a fault.

We lacked experience, I admit it, we lack it perhaps still today. But we endeavoured to substitute to it honesty, patriotism in our initiatives, legality and equity in our achievements, loyal service to the interests of the Bulgarian people and state, a disinterested service in the protection of these interests.

According to the special recommendations of the Chief of State and sharing His preoccupations with the disquieting situation created by the attempt of a coup d'etat in October 1935, the Government constituted at the end of November of the same year, had the imperative duty to take urgent and energetic measures to restore order.

This task was not as easy as it may seem today. But, thanks to the efforts for conciliation patiently made by the Government, inspired by its love for the country and the people, supported by a strong instinct of self-preservation, security and tranquillity have been restored. An era of peace was opened in this country which more than one foreign state may have envied.

In these days two methods were opened before the Government. One was the retrogression to the past. If the Government had adopted it, it should have immediately restored all restricted liberties and proceeded to legislative elections. The Government, however, found in itself the strength, the courage and the determination to take the other way, the thorny way of the responsibilities amidst which it has presented itself to you, the way which will lead the country to a quiet and happy future.

The authors of the Constitution will pardon us for having maintained the limitation of certain liberties, for we have not imposed it; we found it as an inheritance. The Bulgarian people will pardon us also, we hope, for it is for its sake that we have committed that sin, if it is one, for it has not forgotten that in the past our fundamental law has been violated under the pressure

of other instigations which had nothing to do with the interests of the country.

What I have said about the Constitution should not let you presume that the Government is inclined, on account of its conceptions, to rank among the enemies of the Constitution. Such a presumption would be wrong and belied beforehand by the efforts which the Government has unceassingly devoted, during the period of its administration, to restore all the provisions of the Constitution.

Speaking of restrictions, I am perhaps wrong in using the plural, because the discussions which have taken place in the Chamber have shown that what concerns most of the representatives of the people, is only the control of the press, which was established before us in violation of Art. 79 of the Constitution, but which was maintained by the Government in order to make easier a pacification of the atmosphere in the country and in order to avert the inevitable frictions which may have resulted from it in the international relations of Bulgaria. The freedom of the press is a sword with a double edge. When the project of a law on the press, a project which will soon be submitted to the Chamber, is discussed, you will have the task of conciliating the freedom of the press with the requirements of the interests of the State.

In the first lines of the Cabinet's Declaration of November 26, 1935, the Cabinet announced to the people that it would consider the possibilities of a participation of the people in the government of the country and that it would prepare the conditions therefor. This promise did not safeguard the Government from the reproach that it tended to establish in this country an authoritarian power, was was done in certain other countrues.

We must recognize that this accusation was justified to a certain extent by the tardiness with which the Government proceeded to hold legislative elections, This tardiness, however, is due to reasons independent of the good will of the Government. Never - I emphazize the word never - have the Governments over which I have had the honor to preside, considered any other system of government than a democratic government in the framework of the Constitution. Amy other system would be contrary to the character, life and traditions of the Bulgarian people. But democracy is not in good health. It suffers, not only in this country but in other countries as well, of faults which must be rectified.

A new democracy should be created, a democracy of conciliation and union, a democracy which would unite the forces instead of opposing them against each other. This is the system of government which the Cabinet follows and that it wants to strengthen in the hope that its efforts will find the support of all good Bulgarians.

It is with these conceptions of a reformed democracy that the Government began to prepare the bills by which

the people were to participate first in municipal affairs and later in state affairs.

However, a strange agitation was initiated at the time of municipal elections, by those who had previously reproached to the Government of keeping the people out of power; these discontented elements were all the old captains of the parties and their followers. The Bulgarian people in the municipal elections rejected the partisan spirit and its manifestations. It gave a great shock to those who endeavoured to turn the wheel back.

Remembering the struggle and hatred among the parties in the past and comparing it with the present, the people expressed its preference by approaving indirectly by its vote the new system of government.

For the second time the Bulgarian people approved this system at the time of the last legislative elections, expressing thus its desire that the system should be maintained.

What preoccupies particularly certain representatives of the people, the "new" which they cannot accept and which should have been "old", had our Constitution been normally applied, is that the representatives of the Executive Power are not at the same time the representatives of the Legislative Power, that they are not, as they say, "vested with the confidence of the people". But, where, in which one of its provisions does the Constitution stipulate it? Article 90 says to the contrary in specifying that "the Ministers may sit in the Chamber and take part in the debates." Article 90 stresses that the Ministers sit in the Chamber and take part in the debates not as persons elected by the people, but as representatives of the Chief of State who has, according to Art. 9, the legislative power.

It is evident, consequently, that when the Constitution was elaborated, its authors were guided by the classical principle of the division of the power in the state into three distinct powers: the executive power, the legislative power and the judicial power, the same principle as was adopted after the Revolution in the first French Constitution.

The three powers of the state must not compete and counteract each other, but on the contrary must maintain harmonious relations, cooperate and assist each other. This was undoubtedly the conception of the authors of the Bulgarian Constitution.

What would happen in the event of a conflict between the three subdivisions of the power of the state and more particularly between the executive and the legislative powers, since neither of them can predominate over the other on account of their independent nature? The Chief of State in whom the three powers are united, will intervene and solve the conflict in keeping with the interests of the country.

I shall not dwell on another stipulation of the law on legislative elections which is criticized, a stipulation which breaks with the past practice and which suppresses the mediation of the old parties between the electorate and the elected. It is evidently in complete harmony with the text of the Constitution which gives the Bulgarian voter the right to give his vote and his confidence to that of his fellow-citizens whom he considers the most worthy to represent him. In the past this right of the Bulgarian voter was restricted; he could elect only the persons designated on the party lists drafted by the party committees.

I said that the first preoccupation of the Cabinet of November 1935 was to establish internal peace; the second was to ensure the frontiers of Bulgaria and, by establishing stable external peace, to avert dangers and possible international complications.

The end of the World War found our country on the side of the defeated. All the hopes that the Bulgarian people had placed in its soldiers, were annihilated. The small hope which was left was kept alive by the League of Nations alone.

Certain events, however, have seriously affected the prestige of and authority of the League of Nations which was unable to justify the expectations which were placed in it. In spite of that, Bulgaria remains attached to the Geneva institution to which she is profoundly grateful for its intervention in tragic circumstances, and continues to see in it a hope for small and weak nations.

Without wanting to judge the foreign policy of the preceding governments, I cannot fail to state that when I took the direction of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on April 21, 1935, in Mr. Tosheff's Cabinet, I was confronted with the consequences of an unclear, undecided and hesitant foreign policy. The consequences were an international isolation of Bulgaria and a shaken confidence in her. In order to lead the country out of this situation, Mr. Tosheff's Government adopted a loyal, sinciere and pacific policy, a policy of understanding and agreement with all states, which policy was pursued by the Governments which I had the honor to preside over. This policy is appreciated at its right value especially by our neighbors, and has given and still gives good results for Bulgaria. Confidence in her is restored, her international prestige continues to increase unceasingly.

The atmosphere of confidence toward Bulgaria has enabled the Government to proceed with the elaboration and signature of an inviolable pact of peace and perpetual friendship with our Slav neighbor Yougoslavia.

This pact, which is of the greatest importance, has terminated the last page of the history of the bloody discords between the two brother nations and opened new

pages which are marked by manifestations of cordial friendship and pacific cooperation. I emphazize particularly and in the first place the favorable change which has occured in the relations between Bulgaria and Yougoslavia, because the experiences and disappointments of the past have shown to us that a number of the misfortunes which have befallen the Bulgarian people would have been avoided if misunderstandings and dissensions had not existed with our Western neighbor.

The friendly relations with Turkey - the only neighboring state which was not against Bulgaria in the World War - have been shadowed in the recent past, we must admit it not without any wrong on our part. Today these relations are developping to the great satisfaction of both countries in the spirit of the Pact of perpetual friendship which unites them since 1925.

With Roumania we have renewed in the last two years the negotiations on the settlement of the litigious questions. As good will exists on both sides, the Government hopes to reach soon a satisfactory agreement on these questions, which will help to intensify friendly relations between the two countries.

The negotiations engaged several years ago with Greece on the liquidation of reciprocal claims of financial nature, inevitable inheritance from the War, have been conducted until now with more or less long interruptions. As the desire of both the Bulgarian and the Greek Governments is to come to an agreement without delay, I believe that a satisfactory solution will be reached soon. Speaking of the relations with Greece I must mention that the Government of Mr. Metaxas has shown a friendly attitude in consenting to divide the problems of economic nature from those of a different nature, thus taking into consideration suggestions made in the past. This has enabled the Government to reach with Greece a formula of agreement which opens, although in a limited scope, the Greek market to Bulgarian agricultural products.

Speaking of the relations of Bulgaria with the different Balkan countries I must mention the Balkan Pact to which these countries are a party. The reasons which have prevented our country from joining in the Balkan Pact were explained by the leaders of foreign policy at the time. The same reasons continue to exist. However, the Bulgarian Government has established with the Balcan Entente (Pact), taken as a group of powers, bonds of understanding and cooperation on all its objectives, intentions and manifestations which are not opposed to the interests of Bulgaria. This was achieved at the Conference of Montreux and at that of Nyon. The same will happen in all similar cases.

It may be said that Bulgaria is conducting a policy identical to that of the Balkan Pact without being a party to it. Her absence has evidently some disadvantages, but, in exchange, our country is exempted from any of the liabilities foreseen in the Pact.

With the Great Powers, all without exception well disposed with regard to Bulgaria, we entertain good and friendly relations in the economic and cultural fields, which are being developed every day.

You have already heard or will not fail to hear some tendencious rumors disseminated persistently, which pretend that the commercial exchange between Bulgaria and certain countries is founded upon political agreements. I reject with indignation these suspicions which are not only pernicious for the Government, but are also harmful, most harmful for Bulgaria.

I declare clearly and sincerely, I declare very loud so that the entire Bulgarian people may hear it, that the foreign policy of the Government which I preside over is entirely independent, that it is being conducted with the only preoccupation to protect best the interests of the Bulgarian people and I repeat that Bulgaria is not tied up politically with any country, small or great. This independent policy which resembles isolation, may have certain disadvantages, but it has the great advantage to enable the Bulgarian people to look without fear at the dark clouds which accumulate from time to time in the international sky.

With such a policy the Bulgarian people do not run the risk of being forced to fight and shed their blood for foreign interests.

As you see, the foreign policy of Bulgaria is realistic, pacific, loyal, without ambushes or surprises. The results achieved so far are a restored confidence toward Bulgaria and the security of our frontiers.

Another task - much more difficult, you will agree, a task with which the Government was confronted from the first day of its administration, was the financial redressment of the country,

The Minister of Finance will have the opportunity to inform you on our efforts to cover the enormous deficit of one and half billion which the Government has inherited.

Mr. Gouneff will explain to you how important credits were found which the Government utilized for the modern equipment of the Bulgarian Army in order that the latter may be a vigilant guard of the destiny of the Bulgarian people, and that it may defend the frontiers and the independence of our country.

He will tell you also how the Government had the possibility of carrying a program of construction in a scope unknown until now.

I shall not pursue my statement on the general policy of the Government, as well as on the results achieved, because I wish to observe a principle which I have always observed in the course of my government - "less words and more facts". The facts are before you.

You also know the means used by the Government to achieve a national policy. If these means are insufficient it belongs to you to complete them. If you find that they are not in keeping with the goal which is aimed at, you will have to correct them.

The country is addressing you an ardent appeal: Forget the dissensions, put an end to quarrels which reopen wounds, take your hands and unite around the glorious Bulgarian flag and under the wise and high leadership of His Majesty the King in order that we may join our efforts in a common work for the welfare and prosperity of the Bulgarian nation and the greatness of our country.

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EO
PHD

No. 145 Sofia, September 13, 1938.

Subject: International Situation and Bulgaria.

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1938 OCT 4 PM 2 11

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OCT 1938

DIVISION OF POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
OCT 1938
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF
EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
OCT 5 1938
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OCT 6 1938
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

774.00/90

Rating
Grade

Distribution Instructions

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington:

Sir:

I have the honor to transmit a translation of an editorial in the DNES of September 12, 1938, the leading afternoon newspaper of Sofia, on the situation of Bulgaria in relation to the present European crisis. The editorial refers to the wise policy in foreign affairs pursued by Prime Minister Kiosseivanoff, and especially to the pacific policy of Bulgaria towards its neighbors, and concludes by saying "this favorable situation has been achieved in complete independence

FILED
OCT 11 1938

and

and with no commitments on the part of Bulgaria".
In view of the fact that there is a strict censorship in Bulgaria, the latter statement is especially significant at the present time.

Respectfully yours,

K. deG. MacVitty,
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

Enclosure:

Translation.

File 800
KGM/RWH

Enclosure to Despatch No. 145 of September 13, 1938,
American Legation, Sofia.

(Translation)

The International Situation and Bulgaria.

During the last few weeks the international situation in Europe has been under the sign of increasing tension. The time has come to judge the wise and far-sighted policy of internal and external peace conducted by the Cabinets of Dr. Kiosseivanoff in the last few years. In his memorable speech in the Sobranjé, the Prime Minister emphasized that his foreign policy consists in preserving the country from the dangers of possible international complications by establishing a lasting external peace. Not only these words of the Prime Minister, but his entire work for peace and strengthening the position of Bulgaria in the sphere of foreign policy give us good reason to be tranquil; the direction of the state is in firm, experienced and wise hands.

Thanks to the pacific policy pursued by Bulgaria, our relations with our neighbors are improved and based on real friendship. Confidence in Bulgaria is restored and her cultural and economic relations with all countries are constantly being developed and strengthened. In the Balkans, Bulgaria is a factor of peace. In this respect we must particularly emphasize the Pact of Eternal Friendhsip with Yugoslavia, which is of historical significance for peace in the Balkans.

If we turn to the relations of Bulgaria with the Great Powers we see the same gratifying situation. Friendly relations exist between us and all powers without exception. This policy of peace and understanding enables our foreign trade to be developed more and more. This favorable situation has been achieved in complete independence and with no commitments on the part of Bulgaria; for this reason it is approved by the entire nation.

DNES, September 12, 1938.

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
OCT 5 1938
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

No. 144 Sofia, September 12, 1938.

Subject: Statment of Former Prime Minister Nicolas Moushanoff on the Foreign Policy of Bulgaria.

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
OCT 7 1938
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1938 OCT 4 PM 1 54
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

Distribution Instructions

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OCT 8 1938
DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
A-M/3
OCT 11 1938
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

774.00/91

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to enclose a statement on the foreign policy of Bulgaria by Mr. Nicola Moushanoff, Prime Minister of Bulgaria from 1931 to 1934. This statement, an answer to Prime Minister Kiosseivanoff's speech on foreign policy in the Sobranjé (see despatch No. 111 of July 11, 1938), was prepared for the press, but was not permitted by the censorship to be published. Although prepared at the end of July, a copy has only now

FP

FILED
OCT 25 1938

now become available to the Legation.

In his statement, Mr. Moushanoff claims that most of the benefits obtained by Dr. Kiosseivanoff in foreign affairs in reality resulted from projects initiated by his Government.

Regarding relations with Yugoslavia, Mr. Moushanoff says that despite the elapse of over a year since the signature of the Pact of Eternal Friendship between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia very little beyond a veterinary agreement and the simplification of the formalities for visas has been accomplished.

760d.74

His adverse comments on the relations with Greece, Rumania and Turkey during the past few years are of special interest, in view of the recent Salonika Accord (see despatch No. 127 of August 3, 1938).

Respectfully yours,

K. deG. MacVitty,
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

Enclosure:
Translation of statement.

File 800
KGM/RWH

Enclosure to Despatch No. 144 of September 14, 1938,
American Legation, Sofia.

(Translation)

Statement of Mr. Nicolas Moushanoff

The foreign policy of Bulgaria was particularly active during the second half of 1933 and the first half of 1934.

The Prime Minister of Turkey, Ismet Inunu, accompanied by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Rustu Aras, visited Sofia in September 1933 to return my visit to Ankara in 1932. During the visit to Sofia the Treaty of Friendship signed with Turkey in 1925 was renewed a year and a half before its expiration.

In the autumn of 1933 Their Majesties the King and Queen visited the Yugoslav Royal Family, a visit of great historical significance. For the first time our King visited King Alexander and laid the foundations of understanding and friendship between the two nations. The Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the two countries, after an exchange of views on the questions in which both countries were interested, published a communiqué in which they noted the friendly relations established between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and announced the agreement arrived at - a Treaty of Commerce and a Veterinary Agreement - as well as their desire to coordinate the means of communication and to improve the latter between the two countries.

At the beginning of 1934 Their Majesties the King and Queen, accompanied by the Prime Minister, made a visit to King Carol. During that visit also, the two Ministers of Foreign Affairs, after having exchanged views, published a communiqué in which they noted the correct and friendly relations between the two countries

and

and the willingness of their Governments to solve the outstanding questions between them. A month later the Bulgarian Government prepared and transmitted to the Rumanian Government a memorandum containing all Bulgarian claims against Rumania.

In my interviews in the autumn of 1933 at Geneva with Mr. Michalakopoulos, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Tzaldaris, Prime Minister of Greece, views were exchanged on the relations between the two countries. It was agreed to send a Bulgarian delegation to Greece for a clarification with the Greek Government of all outstanding claims between the two countries with a view to their settlement. The delegation which left for Athens was formed by Mr. N. Stoyanoff and Mr. D. Shishmanoff.

Our relations with the great powers were not only correct but friendly. The great powers manifested their friendly attitude towards Bulgaria at the time of the signing of the Balkan Pact. As Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, I refused to permit Bulgaria's joining the Balkan Entente. I did this not because of lack of friendship for our neighbors, but because some of the provisions of the Balkan Pact were incompatible with the Covenant of the League of Nations. However, at the same time as it refused to become a party to the Balkan Pact, the Bulgarian Government assured its neighbors that Bulgaria would pursue her policy of peace and understanding. This policy was duly appreciated and justified by the great powers. I had the proof of it in the personal interviews and conversations I had with

the

the authorized representatives of the great powers at the time of my visits to Berlin, Paris, London and Rome im April 1934. Articles published in authoritative papers like the "Temps" and the "Times" justified the policy of the Bulgarian Government. It is needless to mention the opinion of the Italian and German press.

The foreign policy which I conducted during the period of which I am speaking, was not a personal policy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, but a national policy approved by the prominent representatives of the political parties and entirely approved by public opinion. It was an active policy, drawing its strength and inspiration from the feelings of the people.

On May 19th, the military coup d'etat overthrew the Government over which Iwas presiding. What was the foreign policy of the Cabinets which came to power after that date? We do not know. The events which marked that period prevented us from following the foreign policy of Bulgaria. In the absence of a Parliament and of a free press, the foreign policy of the country was resting in the archives of the ministries, far from the eyes of the people. Only now, the speech of the Prime Minister in the Chamber disperses the darkness which was covering it.

"When in April 1935 I took the portfolio of Foreign Affairs in Mr. Tosheff's Cabinet," says the Prime Minister (Dr. Kiosseivanoff), "I found the consequences of an unclear, indefinite and hesitating foreign policy. These consequences were the international isolation of

Bulgaria

Bulgaria and a shaken confidence in her." This is a sad statement! Within a year only, from May 19, 1934 to April 21, 1935, the confidence in Bulgaria was shaken and the country internationally isolated. We have not the possibility to verify and evaluate the Prime Minister's statement. The Governments of Kimon Georgueff and General Zlateff which were in power during that period , have the possibility to do so. We cannot admit, however, that a Prime Minister would have the courage to address so strong an accusation to his predecessors lightheartedly. We do not wish to presume that a Minister could do that in order to prepare the ground to praise his own policy, a "loyal, realistic and pacific" policy, which has had the good effect of "restoring confidence in Bulgaria and insuring its frontiers through understanding with the Balkan states". It has even insured the frontiers of Bulgaria, which have been imposed by the Treaty of Neuilly.

We are pleased that the pacific, orderly policy of the Bulgarian Government has restored the confidence of our neighbors in our country and has done away with her isolation. We are pleased also by other passages in the Prime Minister's speech. We note with satisfaction that Bulgaria continues to be attached to the League of Nations. With a feeling of relief the Bulgarian people hears the energetic declaration of the Prime Minister that Bulgaria is not bound to anybody, that it is conducting an independent policy, and that the blood of the Bulgarian people will not be shed for foreign interests. We have a feeling of national pride at the words

of

of the Prime Minister that on the question of the Balkan Pact the Government has the same attitude as the one taken in the spring of 1934 by the Cabinet I was presiding over. Finally, the Pact of Eternal Friendship signed with our neighbor Yugoslavia strengthens our hopes for a happier future.

Yet, however much we endeavor to maintain pure and complete satisfaction with the favorable results mentioned, we cannot fail to see the reality of our relations with our neighbors. It gives us a different impression, causes us anxiety and apprehension and spoils our joy. Let us call things by their names. Sincerity and frankness are better friends of understanding than cunning and misrepresentation. The vocabulary of diplomacy contains many attractive and flowery phrases which are pleasant to hear but mean nothing nations thirsty for peace, justice and understanding. They want the words to be always the expression of facts.

Four years have elapsed since the publication of the communiqué with Mr. Yeftitch, a year since the Pact of Eternal Friendship was signed by the Prime Minister and Mr. Stoyadinovitch. Many reciprocal visits of our and Yugoslav cultural, economic and scientific organizations have been exchanged. The Theater of Sofia has been to Belgrade and the Theater of Belgrade has come to Sofia. Cooperative and commercial associations are coordinating their activities. Cordial meetings, inspired speeches, expressions of really brotherly feelings! Has the diplomacy of our neighboring country heard the appeal of the people for understanding? With the exception of

a

a Veterinary Agreement and a simplification of formalities for viasas, we have progressed very little from the point we were at four years ago. We still live with phrases without having given them any content.

About four years have elapsed since the Bulgarian Government sent its memorandum to the Rumanian Government. It enumerated the problems awaiting a settlement: the construction of a bridge on the Danube; pensions to Rumanian subjects of Bulgarian origin; indemnity to the Bulgarian minority for property confiscated unjustly by the Rumanian state; the opening of churches and schools. With the exception of the agreement for a ferryboat on the Danube (and this, after the Rumanian Government had obtained from us an air agreement), no progress has been made regarding the settlement of the outstanding problems; on the contrary, there has been retrogression. The Bulgarian secondary schools in Silistra and Dobritch have been closed and serious handicaps have been created for the Bulgarian primary schools in Rumania.

Four years ago the litigious questions with Greece had been clarified. A few months ago only, a clearing agreement was concluded between our National Bank and the Greek National Bank, a useful achievement, which cannot have, however, the favorable results for our commercial exchange that some people may expect. The other litigious problems are still at the freezing point.

There are fortunately no serious claims between Bulgaria and Turkey. The Treaty of Eternal Friendship has fixed our relations. We cannot understand, however,

the

the hostile feelings which are expressed from time to time in the Turkish press, without any reason or foundations. We understand still less the words of the Prime Minister, that these feelings have been caused by our fault.

These are the facts. We mention them with the sincere desire to promote peace and understanding with our neighbors. To remain silent regarding these facts, does not help to eliminate them. We mention them in order that efforts may be made to eliminate them.

The press of the neighboring countries praised highly the Prime Minister for his speech. It remains for our press and our public opinion to praise the policy of the neighboring states towards us, so that we may live in peace, tranquillity and hope for a better future in the Balkans.

****

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

January 9, 1939.

Summary of despatch no. 182 from Sofia, December 5, 1938.

Subject: Foreign Policy of Mr. Kiosseivanoff.

The position taken by Bulgaria since the war and followed by the present Prime Minister has consistently been that Bulgarian claims must be satisfied before any general settlement can be reached. The Prime Minister's immediate policy seems to be to strengthen the Belgrade-Sofia-Ankara diagonal and he has emphasized the pacts of eternal friendship of Yugoslavia and Turkey, with less emphasis on friendship with Greece and Rumania. The Prime Minister has been rather cagey in defining Bulgarian claims and stresses that in dealing with neighboring countries he prefers to deal with "legitimate rights" by which it is assumed he means the return of the Dobrudja and possibly western Thrace.

He also stresses the "economic needs" of Bulgaria. Claims in respect of "rights of minorities" would not be raised presumably because of the presence of 600,000 Turks in Bulgaria and because of the situation in Macedonia.

Eu:Culbertson:MLD

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 182

Sofia, December 5, 1938

Subject: Foreign Policy of
Mr. Kiosseivanoff.

Copy in Eur

DIVISION OF
EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
JAN 5 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

774.00

774.00/92

CONFIDENTIAL

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1939 JAN 3 PM 3 06
DIVISION OF
COMMUNICATIONS
AND RECORDS

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
JAN 10 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE
JAN 14 1939
MR. WELLES

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to refer to the Legation's despatch No. 176, of November 29, 1938, reporting that the Prime Minister had made a statement on foreign policy before the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of Parliament and that although Mr. Kiosseivanoff's remarks were confidential and were not made public, the Legation understands that the digest

of....

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
A-MC
JAN 1 C 1939
ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF STATE

FILED
JAN 24 1939

GML

of his remarks contained in that despatch was accurate in substance.

The position taken by Bulgaria since the war has consistently been that Bulgarian claims must be satisfied before any general settlement can be reached in the Balkans, and that this is also the policy of Mr. Kiosseivanoff there can be no doubt. As shown in the above-mentioned digest, the Prime Minister was not explicit, but reading between the lines and interpreting what he did say in the light of recent events, it would appear to be Mr. Kiosseivanoff's immediate policy to strengthen the Belgrade-Sofia-Ankara diagonal as much as possible. It will be recalled that in his statement to the Committee he emphasized the pacts of eternal friendship with Yugoslavia and Turkey and though he made a conventional reference to solving pending problems with Greece and Rumania, Bulgaria's eastern and western neighbors were put in a distinctly different category from those of the north and south. This is a logical step following upon the pact of friendship with Yugoslavia and obviously tends to split the Balkan Entente from east to west.

It will also be recalled that he said Bulgaria would not raise any claims in neighboring countries on the "rights of minorities". This is presumably due to the fact that raising such a question would be wholly unacceptable to Yugoslavia, whose aid is necessary to Bulgaria, and since this would also give Turkey an opening

to....

to raise the question of the 600,000 Turks living in Bulgaria. Mr. Kiosseivanoff said that in dealing with neighboring countries, he prefers to stress the "legitimate rights" of Bulgaria, by which it is assumed he means the return of former Bulgarian possessions, such as the Dobrudja and possibly western Thrace. This formula, it should be noted, would presumably be agreeable to Yugoslavia in that it tacitly excludes Macedonia, a territory which, except in the dim past, has never been integrated under Bulgarian administration. On the other hand, this formula could be used as an argument to obtain the return to Bulgaria of her former western frontier territories transferred to Yugoslavia at the end of the Great War.

Another argument which Mr. Kiosseivanoff said should be stressed in dealing with neighboring countries is the "economic needs" of Bulgaria. It is assumed that by this he had particularly in mind the question of an outlet to the Aegean where there is no longer a Bulgarian minority owing to the transfer of populations after the war and, therefore, where the minority argument could not be used effectively. The formula of "economic needs" could also be used as an argument for the return of the Dobrudja which, before its transfer to Rumania, was the principal granary of Bulgaria.

In his statement to the Foreign Affairs Committee Mr. Kiosseivanoff made it clear that he realized that he was dealing with an essentially authoritarian world in which it was more important to approach the ruling powers than to attempt to impress foreign public opinion

with....

with Bulgarian claims. He urged caution, and from the restraint and discretion which he has always used in handling foreign affairs, it can be assumed that it is his policy to raise these problems gradually and when convenient opportunities are offered, with the support of Yugoslavia and Turkey if this is obtainable. In this relation it should be mentioned that the present Government is fully aware that any unilateral action, which Bulgaria might take with a view to satisfying her territorial claims, is not only bound to meet with failure, but would prejudice her case in the future.

Thus, Bulgaria does not intend to ape the "minority" arguments used by Germany and Hungary. This, it should be noted, does not necessarily mean that the "minority" claim as such may not be advanced at some future time, but as has been emphasized by both the King and the Prime Minister in private conversations, "Bulgaria will not initiate any question that would gain her merely the ill-will of the Powers and neighboring States. Bulgaria's rôle will be rather to work with other nations for peaceful solutions of all problems, making clear, however, the reasons for which she does not accept the status quo, in the hope that at some future international conference Bulgaria may state her case before an unantagonized assembly."

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

File 710
HM/MM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

January 9, 1939.

Summary of despatch no. 185, from Sofia, December 12, 1938.

Subject: Bulgaria and the "Drang nach Osten".

Bulgaria, realizing that she lies in the direct path of Germany's classic "Drang nach Osten", accepts Germany's economic domination as far as the Black Sea, but hopes that Germany will be content with this economic dominance in the Danubian area and will not aim at actual sovereignty. While it may be wishful thinking, Bulgarians are inclined to believe that Germany, at least as long as Hitler remains in power, will not attempt to achieve direct political domination of the Balkans.

Bulgaria has effected a slight rapprochement with the Balkan Entente through the recent Salonika Convention which marked the obvious need for Balkan mutual protection against the rising tide of German influence.

There is no immediate prospect of the larger powers stopping the "Drang" and recent events in Czechoslovakia have focused attention on the corridor which that country affords to Rumania and thence to the Ukraine.

Provided

774.00/193

Provided it did not affect Bulgaria, the Bulgarians would have no care with regard to Rumania's fate. Bulgaria will continue to draw closer to Yugoslavia and Turkey, since all three have an interest in averting the "Drang".

PM

Eu:Culbertson:MLD

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 185 Sofia, December 12, 1938

EU
~~PA/D~~
AM/e

Subject: Bulgaria and the "Drang nach Osten."

Copy in Eu

DIVISION OF
EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
JAN 5 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CONFIDENTIAL

774.00
rate
762.74

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	MID ONI } in confidence

JAN 17 1939

5
RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1939 JAN 3 PM 3 06
DIVISION OF
COMMUNICATIONS

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
JAN 10 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

774.00/93

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to submit the following notes on Bulgarian foreign policy.

Needless to say, Bulgaria constantly is aware that she lies in the direct path of Germany's classic "Drang nach Osten" through Yugoslavia to the Straits and the Persian Gulf. The concern lest Germany was actively preparing the ground for the fulfillment of this ideal has been progressively increased by every German move in Central Europe from the Anschluss to the conference at Munich.

FILED
JAN 24 1939

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
~~AM/C~~
JAN 16 1939
ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF STATE

Economically, the German "Drang" as far as the Black Sea is now accepted by Bulgarians as an accomplished fact, which they can see no immediate means of combating.

GML

combating. They hope, nevertheless, that Germany will be content with this economic dominance in the Danubian area and the indirect political influence which this brings with it, and they trust that Germany will not aim at actual sovereignty. While this is wishful thinking, Bulgarians are inclined to believe that Germany, at least as long as Hitler remains in power, will see that it is not in her own interest to attempt to achieve direct political domination of the Balkans. Though this belief is fairly widespread, and German propaganda is trying hard to reassure Bulgaria on this score, a number of informed Bulgarians fear that the German economic dominance, to which they are resigned, may lead to Bulgaria's political subservience, especially when Hitler is succeeded. They are examining, therefore, the chances and means which Bulgaria may have to escape German hegemony.

By the recent Salonika convention Bulgaria has, for the time being at least, affected a slight rapprochement with the Balkan Entente; or to put it in another way, the convention marked the obvious need for a Balkan rapprochement for mutual protection against the rising tide of German influence which surged eastwards after the Anschluss. In this relation it will be recalled that as reported in the Legation's telegram No. 29,of November 10, 4 p.m. the Yugoslav Prime Minister undertook at Nish to broach in the Balkan Pact capitals the question of extending the economic benefits of the Pact to Bulgaria to further a consolidated Balkan economic program.

Bulgaria has of course not escaped the rearmament fever, as evidenced by the unanimous authorization by the Sobranje of fifty million dollars for arms, an

enormous...

enormous sum for this country. But it is fair to assume that Bulgaria, a poor country with an excellent but small army surrounded by suspicious neighbors at whose hands she has suffered grievously in the past, has no bellicose intentions for the immediate future; though of course she does not accept the status quo and on the long view she will not be really satisfied until the various "irredenta" are returned to her.

The only recent Bulgarian official pronouncements on foreign affairs have been those of the Prime Minister which were couched in general terms and along conventional lines, though Mr. Kiosseivanoff's last statement on the subject, discussed in the Legation's despatch No. 182, of December 5, 1938, gave some indication of the trend which Bulgarian foreign policy may take. It may be doubtful whether, in the fluid state of Europe, the Bulgarian Government has been able to formulate a clear-cut policy. However, one is tempted to speculate concerning the lines upon which Bulgarian policy might develop given the considerations touched upon in the preceding paragraphs, and should Germany's "Drang nach Osten" continue unabated.

Since, as seen from Sofia, there is no immediate prospect that the "Drang", in one form or another, will be stopped by the intervention of the Great Powers, Bulgarians may very well come to the conclusion that the next best thing would be to try to divert it into less dangerous channels. The collapse of Czechoslovakia has, of course, focussed attention on the corridor which that country affords to Rumania and thence to the

Ukraine.

Ukraine. Furthermore, the make-up and, in some respects, the position of Rumania, bears an ominous resemblance to that of Czechoslovakia. Of Bulgaria's neighbors, Rumania is certainly the one she now dislikes the most and since she is always hoping to regain the Dobrudja, Bulgaria would be glad to see Rumania suffer a fate similar to Czechoslovakia provided it could be kept within reasonable bounds and not lead to the domination of Rumania by Germany -- or Russia, for that matter.

Therefore, given these considerations, it is perhaps not unreasonable to assume that Bulgaria will continue to draw closer to Yugoslavia and Turkey, her two vigorous and martial neighbors. All three of these countries have, to a greater or less extent, an interest in diverting the "Drang", if it must come at all, to the north of the Danube, and should Bulgaria be successful in consolidating this new group they will presumably tend to draw away from Rumania, leaving her isolated unless some new or dormant influences make themselves felt. It would seem, furthermore, to be in the interest of these three powers to remain neutral at almost all costs in case of war, at least until the outcome is clear. And when and if the time comes for Rumania's crisis, they will, with even less compunction than the western powers in the recent Czechoslovak crisis, wash their hands of Rumania.

I would point out that the foregoing observations are pure speculation, treat of but one aspect of

Balkan....

Balkan politics as seen from Sofia, and are based on the contingency that future events will take a more or less prescribed course -- an unlikely contingency, especially since Russia's position is difficult to foresee. This despatch, therefore, is merely intended to indicate some of the factors which Bulgaria may take into consideration in formulating foreign policy.

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

File 710
HM/MM

2 Carbon copies

4 Carbon Copies
Received

PHA
WSM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

March 4, 1939.

Summary of despatch no. 207 from Legation at Sofia dated January 31, 1939.

Subject: Debate in Bulgarian Parliament

In a debate in the Sobranje on foreign policy, little criticism was made of Prime Minister Kiosseivanoff's technique in dealing with foreign affairs. Bulgaria is apparently "beginning to feel its oats" as there were indications that sentiment is cropping up for a restitution of what is called Bulgaria's normal "rights". These "rights" seem mostly to be centered around the Dobruja, with restitution frankly suggested as the best way to come to proper relations with Rumania. The present policy vis-à-vis Yugoslavia was generally approved and satisfaction was expressed at the improved relations with Turkey and Greece. Significantly, there was applause in the Chamber when the Prime Minister mentioned Yugoslavia and Turkey but his references to Greece and Rumania were received in silence.

Eu:Coe:AMR.

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Sofia, January 31, 1939.

No. 207

Subject: Debate on Foreign Affairs.

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
FEB 14 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

774.00

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1939 FEB 23 PM 2 43
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

Distribution Instructions
OVI
MID
MAR 13 1939
ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
MAR 9 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
APR 8 1939
DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to report that on January 28 and [illegible] a debate on foreign policy took place in Parliament. The speeches attracted more public attention than usual owing to the gravity of international developments which are being followed with keen interest in Bulgaria. As is quite natural, the Munich Conference aroused hopes of new frontiers; and the fact that, besides Germany, revisions were effected in favor of Hungary and Poland, nominally at least on the principle of minorities, led Bulgarian...

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
MAR 10 1939
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

FILED
APR 4 1939

774.00/94

FP

Bulgarian public opinion to believe that the chances for a similar revision in favor of Bulgaria were increasing. At the same time Germany's aggressive policy and the confused situation in Europe has caused considerable apprehension, and the general feeling is that though Bulgaria should not miss any opportunity of obtaining some satisfaction, she should not modify her present policy of caution and freedom of action.

These two points constituted the main theme of the debate. Most of the speakers referred to the problem of Bulgarian minorities in neighboring countries and expressed the desire for a solution on this issue. Specific mention was made only in the case of the Dobrudja whose restitution was frankly suggested as the best way to come to proper relations with Rumania. As regards Yugoslavia, the present policy was generally approved, though some speakers expressed the wish that the Pact of Eternal Friendship of 1937 might lead to more concrete results for Bulgaria. Satisfaction was expressed at the improved relations with Turkey and the renewed efforts to increase trade with Greece.

As regards international developments generally, caution, watchfulness and a more active effort to promote the cause of Bulgaria were recommended. Though it was reiterated that Bulgaria should not become a party to the present Balkan Entente, the hope was expressed that the Balkan powers in their own common interest should grant to Bulgaria the territorial and other concessions which she considers as indispensable prerequisites to her joining a Balkan federation.

With....

With the exception of the recommendations for "a more active foreign policy", no essential criticisms were made of the main lines of the Government's conduct of foreign affairs even by the speakers of the opposition. The debate was interesting chiefly as an indication of the present general feeling in this country as regards its claims and complaints in regard to the peace treaties and the hope that these may be revised, rather than a criticism of any steps Mr. Kiosseivanoff has taken.

The debate was concluded by the Prime Minister with a speech delivered on January 29, a translation of which
1/ is enclosed. Mr. Kiosseivanoff said that Bulgaria's foreign policy of peace and understanding, or as he put it, "of more reason and less sentiment", has proved very successful. He cited, inter alia, the end of the dangerous isolation in which Bulgaria found herself after the conclusion of the Balkan Pact; the signing of the Pact of Eternal Friendship with Yugoslavia; the strengthening of her friendly relations with Turkey; the development of friendly relations with Greece; and, finally, the possibility of restoring the "traditional relations of friendship with Rumania." It is interesting to note that when the Prime Minister mentioned Yugoslavia, there was a spontaneous outburst of applause and to a lesser extent when he mentioned Turkey; whereas his references to Greece and Rumania were received in silence.

The Prime Minister also mentioned the Salonika agreement which freed the country from the military clauses of the Treaty of Neuilly and, in referring to the

League of Nations, stated that while Bulgaria had reasons to be grateful to that institution, weak nations could no longer look to it for assistance. He referred to the settlement of disputes by the Great Powers and said that for this reason Bulgaria was forced to seek support from these nations without, however, incurring any political obligations.

Respectfully yours,

Hugh Millard

Hugh Millard
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

Enclosure:
Translation of speech
by Prime Minister.

File 710/803
HM/MM

Enclosure to despatch No. 207,
January 31, 1939, Sofia.

n

TRANSLATION OF PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH
(delivered January 29, at the conclusion of the debate on the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.)

My statement on foreign policy will be short as I had recently the opportunity of submitting detailed explanations to the parliamentary committee on foreign affairs when nearly all of the deputies were present and I was able to answer most of the questions raised here these last two days.

Those of you who took part in the debate on the foreign policy of the Government, in connection with the discussion of the budget of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, have spoken as good Bulgarians, devoted to their country and solicitous of the destiny of our people and our State. They refrained from expressing violent criticism, accusations and reproaches, which are not uncommon on other occasions, because, I presume, they felt that at the present time any weapons directed against the Government would affect the country itself.

And yet, some of them showed a certain lack of discretion, which I do not consider intentional, in expressing opinions which may arouse suspicions beyond our frontiers and cause difficulties to the Government in its efforts to obtain support and protection for Bulgarian interests.

At times as these, when international events cause anxiety and alarm which force nations -- large and small, but particularly the small ones -- to strengthen friendships and form new ones in order to be able to protect their rights and national interests -- and perhaps their very existence -- I consider it highly unreasonable to encourage hopes and expectations which are not commensurate with the power and possibilities of our country, and which can only cause bitter disappointment and diminish the confidence of our people.

For this reason the Government, at the risk of becoming unpopular, will continue to pursue the policy of peace and understanding adopted in recent years, being fully conscious of the responsibilities to the Bulgarian nation and having the firm conviction that in this way it best protects its interests.

This policy of more reason and less sentiment has already shown encouraging results. Sincere and loyal, it is justly appreciated and has contributed to the establishment of friendly relations and understanding; to the desire of solving by pacific methods all pending questions and those which may arise in the future; and to the willingness to cooperate in the protection of the common Balkan interests.

This policy restored and strengthened the confidence in Bulgaria, created security on her frontiers and the tranquillity so indispensable for the pacific progress of the Bulgarian people. This realistic foreign policy has removed our country from the dangerous isolation in which she found herself after the conclusion, five years ago, of the Balkan Pact.

This....

This policy made it possible to bring about the historical change in our relations with the brotherly Yugoslav people; to put an end to our long dissensions and the bloody struggle which caused such immeasurable evil to our country; and to sign last year the Pact of Eternal Friendship with Yugoslavia which is of such great significance for the future development of the two countries.

The same policy strengthened and rendered more cordial our friendly relations with the Turkish Republic, in the spirit of the Pact of Friendship of 1925, the first and for a long time the only pact signed by Bulgaria after the wars.

This policy made it possible to establish and develop friendly relations with our neighbor Greece and to renew the economic relations which had been interrupted for several years and which will probably soon be strengthened by the conclusion of a regular treaty of commerce.

The same policy will enable us, with mutual goodwill which is not lacking, to restore the traditional relations of friendship with our neighbor on the Danube--Rumania.

The relations of friendship and confidence which have been so happily established with the neighbors of Bulgaria in pursuance of this policy of peace, were the indispensable preliminary conditions for the signature in Salonika on July 31, 1938, of an agreement by which Bulgaria was relieved from the restrictive and humiliating military clauses imposed by the Treaty of Neuilly. Thus, twenty years after the end of the war, Bulgaria has regained the rights of an entirely independent State, and the courageous Bulgarian army has obtained the liberty to prepare for its mission to protect the frontiers of the State and to defend the interests of the country.

The Agreement of Salonika, concluded between Bulgaria and the States of the Balkan Entente, represented by the Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. Metaxas, is the first pacific revision of treaties effected in conformity with the provisions of Article 19 of the League of Nations' Covenant, by the mutual consent of the Balkan States concerned and with the approval of the Great Powers. This agreement is undoubtedly a great success for Bulgaria's foreign policy. Unfortunately, its importance and significance have been understood and appreciated better abroad than here. This is due, perhaps, to that spirit of negation which blinds one to the achievements of others.

The recent international events have lessened the significance of the League of Nations to which Bulgaria has reasons to be particularly grateful. The League, unfortunately, can no longer serve as the support and hope of the small and unjustly-treated nations and fulfill their expectations. The settlement of international problems and disputes by the Great Powers, without regard to the League of Nations, forces Bulgaria to direct her untiring efforts toward gaining their friendship and their moral support. For this reason,

the.....

the Government will persevere, in spite of temptations, in its pursuance of an independent policy without political obligations toward any of the Great Powers, so as to avoid making enemies. This will enable our country, with its geographical and international position, to be alone the master of its destiny.

This is Bulgaria's foreign policy, free from illusions, animosity and adventures, for whose continuation the Government expects to have your support and the approval of the entire Bulgarian people.

In the history of Bulgaria there are many brilliant pages of which any nation might be proud. There are also, however, dark pages which we must often read in order to learn how to avoid repeating the fatal mistakes of the past, because the same causes may bring about the same disappointments and sufferings to our country. In these days of anxiety which may be trying to the Bulgarian nation, our country needs all her sons who must form one force, one spirit and one will in order that Bulgaria may follow her historical path and take her place in the family of nations.

****

ML

TELEGRAM RECEIVED

GRAY

Sofia

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
APR 22 1939
DEPARTMENT

FROM Dated April 21, 1939

Rec'd 7:45 p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
APR 24 1939
DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

Secretary of State

Washington

774.00

23, April 21, 3 p. m.

The Prime Minister speaking before the Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday made a confidential declaration which I am informed was in substance as follows:

Bulgaria is determined to remain strictly neutral as between the axis and anti-aggression bloc. The Balkan Entente as originally conceived has been so weakened by recent events that it now hardly exists.

Bulgaria's relations with Yugoslavia and Turkey based on pacts of friendship continue to be excellent.

As regards Bulgaria's claims he said they are the 1915 frontiers plus southern Dobrudja. Without saying so directly the Prime Minister gave the Committee the impression that he had been approached on the possibility of a settlement of the Dobrudja question but that he considered this insufficient; which has been interpreted to mean that he would not entertain an offer which did not include an outlet to the Aegean.

He assured the Committee that there would be no change

FILED
APR 25 1939

774.00/95
GML

change in the present policy nor would any new obligations be assumed without approval of Parliament. The session of the committee continues.

MILLARD

EMB

DOCUMENT FILE

NOTE

774.00

774.00/96

SEE 874.032/62 FOR #248

FROM Bulgaria (Millard) DATED May 3, 1939

TO NAME

1—1127 ...

REGARDING: Detailed survey of the international and Balkan situation made by the Prime Minister to Parliament

Reports-.

dg

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

June 19, 1939.

Summary of despatch no. 262 from Legation at Sofia dated June 1, 1939.

Subject: Bulgarian Foreign Policy

Mr. Atherton says that public opinion in Bulgaria continues to be disappointed with the foreign policy of King Boris and the Prime Minister as it offers no hope for the territorial revisions so ardently desired. Since the British guarantees to Rumania and Greece of April 13 Rumania has taken a very definite attitude against any discussions regarding the Southern Dobrudja, and the murder of the 22 Bulgarians at the border is interpreted in Sofia as a warning to Bulgaria against any pretensions in that area.

On his way to Ankara M. Potemkin discussed with M. Kiosseivanoff Bulgaria's entry into the Balkan Entente, and the Bulgarian Prime Minister apparently was hopeful that the Soviet Vice-Commissar would be able to carry a stage further the discussions which M. Kiosseivanoff had himself initiated during

his

his visit to Ankara some months ago. However, on his return from the Turkish capital, M. Potemkin told the Bulgarian Prime Minister that the attitude of the Turkish Foreign Minister had undergone a considerable change and M. Potemkin saw little likelihood of any Turkish good offices to facilitate Bulgaria's entry into the Balkan Entente.

The other wing of the Prime Minister's foreign policy since 1938 has been close cooperation with Belgrade. Pressure from the Axis Powers on Yugoslavia and a consolidation of her present accord with Italy or adherence to the Axis would further impair M. Kiosseivanoff's foreign policy, as there is little pro-Axis sentiment in Bulgaria.

Nevertheless, M. Moshanoff, President of the Sobranje and a likely successor to the Prime Minister, accepted Hitler's invitation to visit Berlin on his 50th birthday. He was unquestionably impressed by the occasion.

Mr. Atherton closes on the note that, as in the past, the final decisions regarding Bulgaria's foreign policy lie with the King who will endeavor to maintain Bulgaria's independent policy and neutrality.

Eu:Coe:AMR.

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 262 Sofia, June 1, 1939.

Subject: Bulgarian Foreign Policy.

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS JUN 14 1939 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

774.00 2006

RECEIVED DEPARTMENT OF STATE 1939 JUN 13 PM 3 00 DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	MID instruct confidential
	ONI " " "

JUN 26 1939

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS MR. DUNN JUN 22 1939 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

774.00/97

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A-M/C JUN 24 1939 ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE JUN 30 1939 DIVISION OF NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

The Honorable
The Secretary of State,
Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to report, based on conversations I have recently had here, more extended than ordinarily in view of many contacts as a result of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Sofia University, that public opinion continues bitterly disappointed that the foreign policy of the King and the Prime Minister apparently offers no hopes for the territorial revisions so ardently desired here. Secondly, I have noted an outspoken and growing criticism of the democratic powers, more especially directed toward England,

since...

G/HC

FILED JUL 5 - 1939

since through the English and, incidentally, French guarantees given to Rumania and Greece and, finally, the Anglo-Turkish accord, the bases on which Bulgaria hoped to negotiate with these countries for her entry into the Balkan Pact have been completely altered if not destroyed altogether. In fact, since April 13 not only has Rumania taken a very definite attitude against any approach to discussions looking towards a return of the Southern Dobrudja, but undoubtedly, as escaped prisoners have proven, permitted official connivance in a series of murders of Bulgarians at Belitza, reported in the Legation's telegram No. 29, of May 15. Such an action can but be interpreted as a warning to Bulgaria against any pretensions in that area.

771.74

In the Legation's despatch No. 223, of March 23, reference was made to the Prime Minister's visit to Ankara and the hopes entertained at that time for a policy based on Bulgarian-Turkish understanding. On April 26 when Mr. Potemkin first visited Sofia on his way to Ankara, he discussed with Mr. Kiosseivanoff Bulgaria's entry into the Balkan Entente, and the Prime Minister at some length outlined the attitude of Bulgarian public opinion in this connection and apparently was most hopeful that Mr. Potemkin in his conversations at Ankara would be able to carry a stage further the discussions which Mr. Kiosseivanoff had himself initiated during his visit there. However, on May 7 Mr. Potemkin, on his return from Ankara, again visited Sofia and I am informed he advised the Prime Minister that since Mr. Kiosseivanoff's

767.74

conversations...

conversations with Mr. Saraçoğlu and especially since the guarantees of April 13 and the announcement of the Anglo-Turkish accord, the attitude of the Turkish Foreign Minister had undergone a change, and Mr. Potemkin saw little likelihood of any Turkish good offices to facilitate Bulgaria's entry into the Balkan Pact. Indeed, on the contrary, since the Italian descent on Albania Turkey has had from six to eight divisions on the Bulgarian-Thracian frontier and, although the official reason given is that these troops are a precaution against an Italian invasion of the Balkans, my Greek colleague has pointed out the Prime Minister's references to the Aegean (see Legation's telegram No. 23, of April 21) and contends the stationing of these troops is necessary as a warning to Bulgaria against military action in seeking an outlet to that sea.

The other wing of the Prime Minister's foreign policy since 1937 has been close cooperation with Yugoslavia. However, with the recent German-Italian alliance, it is anticipated here that very shortly pressure may be brought upon the Yugoslav Government to consolidate further her present accord with Italy, even to join the Berlin-Rome axis. Such a development would further thwart the Prime Minister's foreign policy, since up to the present I can see little if any sentiment in this country for joining the axis, and Bulgarian opinion likewise believes that public opinion in Yugoslavia is also strongly anti-German.

It is...

It is interesting in this connection, however, to consider the Prime Minister's remarks, reported in my telegram No. 33, of May 23, in which, conscious of the apparent obstacles that exist now in further conversations with the Greeks and Turks, he still envisages the possibility of a Balkan Pact against outside aggression to include Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Rumania.

In this situation the arrival of a new German Minister to Sofia is followed with considerable interest. In his conversations with the Government, I am informed he has referred to the close ties between Germany and Bulgaria during the Great War, the present economic interdependence of the two countries and, while not attempting to exert any pressure, has said his Government's policy was for further developing the good relations between the two nations. I am also informed from an official source, however, that he has stated Germany would continue to make deliveries of war material to this country without imposing any political conditions. On the other hand, I learn that in recent conversations here, other German officials who have been in Bulgaria have pointed out that the commitments of the democratic countries in southeastern Europe do not permit any room for Bulgarian aspirations; that little economic assistance may be expected from either England or France (see Legation's despatch No. 261, of May 26); and that Bulgaria will do well to maintain at all costs her independent policy, both political and economic, the evident assumption being that time will prove to Bulgaria that her

eventual...

eventual interests may lie with Germany, Italy and Yugoslavia in a totalitarian drive towards the Aegean.

The President of the Sobranié, Mr. Stoitcho Moshanoff, considered the strongest candidate to succeed the Prime Minister, accepted Hitler's invitation to visit Berlin on the occasion of his fiftieth anniversary and, although reportedly strongly pro-French in sentiment, this visit unquestionably made a deep impression on him. He has had conversations with the present German Minister and I venture to attach as of interest a report of a newspaper interview given to Mr. Roubaud of the French paper LE PETIT PARISIEN early last week. 1/

I have attempted here briefly to outline certain considerations which must predominate in the determination of Bulgaria's future policy. As in the past, the final decision will lie with the King; but those closest to him insist he will endeavor to maintain Bulgaria's independent policy and neutrality, and there is little doubt but that the Prime Minister's hold on his present position is due to the fact that it would be impossible to replace him with any other Bulgarian capable of carrying on this policy as effectively.

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

Enclosure:
Translation of
newspaper article.

File 710
RA/MM

Carbon Copy
Received

Enclosure to despatch No. 262,
of June 1, 1939, Sofia.

TRANSLATION OF INTERVIEW GIVEN BY
PRESIDENT OF SOBRANIE TO FRENCH JOURNALIST.

In the "PETIT PARISIEN" of May 19, 1939, Louis Roubaud publishes an interview with Mr. Stoitcho Moshanoff, the President of the Sobranié.

"The incident of Belitza is very untimely, Mr. Moshanoff said. If you had come a few days before the incident, you could hear people speak of Rumania with sympathy. The bitterness we feel about the Rumanians is not hatred. We have not forgotten the old times of Turkish rule when the Bulgarian revolutionists used to find a friendly shelter in Rumania. The excitment the incident of Belitza aroused is increasing every day. Cinema performances are interrupted by unknown speakers and the public replies by singing the national anthem. Whereas we are endeavouring to improve our relations with Rumania, this incident reopens a sore which cannot be cured - the sore of Dobrudja.

"Let me answer your more general question: what is, at this time of expectancy, the attitude of public opinion in Bulgaria? You remember that in 1919 Bulgaria was forced to sign at Neuilly an unfortunate peace treaty. Although we consider ourselves as the victim of an unjustice, we accepted and loyally carried out the provisions of the treaty. We paid reparations. We observed the strict and humiliating provisions which abolished our national defense. In the last 20 years all treaties have beem abolished except ours. Everything was conceded to the strong nations, nothing to our small and pacific country.

"In the present grave atmosphere in Europe we are determined to keep our self-control so as to avert a war which we do not desire. After the cruel lessons we had in the recent past, we shall wait in silence and peace until we rereive justice. Let me give you an example of our restraint: after having waged three wars for the liberation of our brothers, we keep silent to-day on the largest part of our rights. But we cannot live without this part of the Dobrudja on which the existence of Varna and Roussé depends. We want the cession of the territory (South Dobrudja) which was given to us in 1877 in Berlin. Instinctively the people feel that this cession is of capital importance. South Dobrudja has become an obsession. You know that the Rumanians fought in order that this province be given to us and that none of them has lost a drop of blood in order to take it from us. This province represents 16% of our wheat production, whereas it is only 1% of the Rumanian wheat production. This practical and economic consideration is closely connected with our political activity. The German market

absorbs . . . .

absorbs 80% of our exports. It does not depend on us alone to find new markets for our products. We made offers which were rejected everywhere except in Germany. England may purchase and consume all the products we sell to Germany. When an English economic mission undertook a tour of information in the Balkans, it stopped in Rumania, Yougoslavia and Greece, but Sofia was not on its itinerary. Economics and politics are closely connected here as everywhere, but you must not conclude that we are fatally driven against you by these circumstances.

"It is true that certain recent events have had a painful repercussion here. A favorable movement for a Bulgaro-Rumanian understanding appeared after the annexation of Bohemia, which frightened Bucharest. But the English guarantee given not only for the Hungaro-Rumanian frontier but for the Balkan frontiers of Rumania as well, did away with the desire for understanding on the part of Rumania and strengthened her intransigeant attitude as regards Bulgaria. In spite of that, at a time when almost all our neighbors have resorted to a smaller or larger mobilization, we remain the only country which has not mobilized one man. Briefly, our desire for peace in the Balkans is obvious. We have been treated, however, as the parias of the Balkans. The Balkan Entente is directed against us whereas if we were in it, it could form a military bloc of experienced soldiers.

"Instead of asking for a complete redressment of all the mistakes which have been made, we are prepared to be satisfied with a minimum of justice. The Bulgarians like and admire your country; the general desire is that war should be averted. For this reason we tell you: Help us in order that we may remain neutral!"

TK

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

July 14, 1939.

Summary of Despatch No. 269, from the Legation at Sofia, dated June 14, 1939.

Subject: Bulgaria's Foreign Policy.

Mr. Atherton learns that when the Governor of the Bulgarian National Bank attended the last meeting of the Bank of International Settlements at Basel he had instructions at the time to proceed to Germany very confidentially and explain, as from the King, that any attempt by Germany to force Bulgaria to abandon her policy of neutrality must meet with failure, since public opinion was very mindful that a departure from this policy had been very costly in the past; secondly, public opinion at the moment in Bulgaria is not friendly to Germany.

There have been a number of German semi-official missions in Bulgaria. Mr. Atherton has been informed that the blocked marks account of the Bulgarian Government has been reduced from 27 million to 20 million Reichsmarks.

In

In connection with Prince Paul's visit to Berlin, it is reported that the Germans brought forward a plan for a Danubian confederation to include Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Rumania. It was reported in Sofia that Prince Paul will shortly proceed to London.

There is evidence of strengthened Bulgarian-Italian relations, as a cultural agreement was recently signed, and a Bulgarian economic mission had gone to Rome to negotiate a new clearing agreement.

774.00/98

COR
Eu:Coe:DG

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 269 Sofia, June 14, 1939

EU
PAD

Subject: Supplementing Despatch No. 262, June 1, on Bulgaria's foreign policy.

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
JUN 29 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1939 JUN 28 PM 1 10
DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	MID ONI — strict confidence

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
JUL 18 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

774.00/98

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to refer to my despatch No. 262, of June 1, and to report further conversations with usually well-informed sources which are interesting as they bear on aspects of Bulgarian foreign policy.

In my last conversation with the Prime Minister, reported in my telegram No. 33, of May 23, he took occasion to refer to the arrival of a new German Minister and added there had been no attempt to influence the present course of German-Bulgarian relations. This is

interesting...

197
FILED
JUL 22 1939
FP

interesting since I am informed that when the Governor of the Bulgarian National Bank attended the last meeting of the Bank of International Settlements at Basel he had instructions at the time to proceed to Germany very confidentially and explain "in certain defined quarters" as from the King that any attempt by Germany to force Bulgaria to abandon her policy of neutrality must meet with failure, since public opinion was very mindful that a departure from this policy had been very costly in the past and, secondly, public opinion at the moment in this country was not friendly to Germany.

Meanwhile there have been a series of German semi-official missions in the country and Dr. Landewehr, Chief of the Department of Exports and Credits in the German Ministry of Economics, is in Bulgaria at the present time. I am informed that in his conversations here reference has been made to the unusual seasonal decrease of German purchases in this country and I am reliably informed in this connection that the blocked marks account of the Bulgarian Government has been reduced from a figure of 27 millions, reported in the Legation's despatch No. 226, of April 4, to somewhere in the vicinity of 20 million Reichsmarks today. Dr. Landewehr has stated that he very much regretted the perishable nature of the major part of Bulgarian exports to Germany and stated he would like to increase German purchases of hard grain and durable goods. The Bulgarians, however, are reluctant to reduce wheat stocks in the country now and pointed out that the mining rights

and...

and concessions which had been granted to Germany in comparatively recent negotiations must certainly be considered as a basis for increasing Bulgarian exports of non-perishable goods.

I understand that in Berlin the Foreign Office has suggested to the Bulgarian Minister there that Bulgaria might see her way clear to withdraw membership from the League of Nations. From my observations in this country, I cannot believe that this is a suggestion that will be readily adopted.

Much opinion here is centered on Yugoslavia and especially on Prince Paul's visit to Berlin. Apart from the official communiqués evincing that Yugoslavia has neither adhered to the Rome-Berlin axis nor joined the anti-Comintern pact, nor left the League of Nations, few unpublished details have reached this country. Belgrade press reports published here, however, claim that the Prince Regent showed genuine desire to maintain friendly relations with Germany and the frontiers were "fixed forever." I am informed that the Germans brought forward, inter alia, a plan for a Danubian confederation which would include Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Rumania. It is reported here that Prince Paul will shortly proceed to London. Meanwhile Berlin continues to press the view that the Bulgarian Prime Minister has not returned the visit of Baron von Neurath made in June, 1937 (see Legation's despatch No. 393, of June 12, 1937), and it is understood here that at some convenient moment, after a suitable

lapse....

lapse following the visit of Prince Paul, Mr. Kiosseivanoff may proceed on a visit to Berlin, after which he will return to this capital and probably set out again for further visits to London, Paris and probably Rome and Belgrade. Indeed, with a feeling in this country that Yugoslavia is the most sympathetic of the Balkan neighbors, considered opinion here is increasingly pronounced against any Bulgarian foreign policy that will conflict with Belgrade. In a recent press interview given a foreign journalist by the Prime Minister, he allegedly stated that Bulgaria has relinquished any territorial claims she might have entertained against Yugoslavia. This is very similar to a statement he also made two years ago to a journalist and has caused some criticism among Bulgarian Macedonians. It is of interest in this connection to note that the President of the Parliament, Mr. Stoitcho Moshanoff, in the newspaper interview quoted in part in my despatch No. 262, of June 1, made a very similar statement, though less categoric, to that of the Prime Minister, reported above.

At the present moment there is evidence of a strengthening of Bulgarian-Italian relations. Not only was there a cultural agreement recently signed, reported in despatch No. 268, of June 12, but also a Bulgarian economic mission has left for Rome to negotiate a new clearing agreement to supplement the present one which expires on the 30th of the present month. In these negotiations the Italians are hopeful of increasing export

quotas...

quotas and increasing the economic relations of the two countries.

Since the Sofia University celebrations, mentioned in my despatch No. 262, of June 1, the King has limited his interviews and markedly withdrawn from any public participation in affairs, which might be open to false conjecture.

Respectfully yours,

Ray Atherton

X

File 710
RA/MM

4 Carbon Copies
Received WVM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

July 13, 1939.

JRK
LC
HMS
JDH
RHA
WSM

Summary of Despatch No. 277, from Legation at Sofia, dated June 28, 1939.

Subject: Bulgarian Foreign Policy.

The Yugoslav Minister in Sofia said that the Yugoslav Foreign Minister believes that Hitler realizes that a European war would not be short, and that in the end Germany might jeopardize all that she had obtained already. Hitler also was convinced that he could obtain advantages through creating a series of crises which might eventually decide the democratic powers to negotiate on terms favorable to Germany.

This Yugoslav source said that Prince Paul had been told during his Berlin visit that the German General Staff war plan envisages an immediate southeastern sweep through Yugoslavia and Bulgaria to the Aegean, with Italy attacking Greece and aiming at Salonika before it could be occupied by a British fleet. Thus, Rumania would be isolated and might very well not come into the war at all.

The

774.00/

The Yugoslav Minister stated that if his country were to ally itself with the democratic powers, its territory would necessarily become the first battleground of Europe. His country's policy, like that of Bulgaria, lies in maintaining neutrality; ~~and~~ but sentiment throughout Yugoslavia is strongly against German domination.

Mr. Atherton finds the withdrawal of the French credit a stupid move, as the credit would automatically have expired in a few weeks. Two years ago Mr. Atherton ~~had~~ outlined the views of a very able French group who were urging upon the French Government and also upon the English the formation of a Balkan Commercial Company with ~~the~~ capital supplied by the Governments. Such a commercial concern would have brought French and British businessmen into the Balkan markets, offsetting Germany and building up a more effective financial policy than the hit-and-miss methods that England and France have attempted recently to follow in the Balkans.

Relations with Rumania remain strained, and public opinion has criticised M. Gafencu for his speeches at Ankara and Athens on the aims of the Balkan Entente. Moreover, Bucharest has recently raised economic difficulties with Sofia on the question of foreign exchange balances that are

due.

due. Parenthetically, Mr. Atherton points out that a German in Sofia said that there were between five and six thousand German investigators, engineers, and economists in Rumania fostering German interests in that country.

The Bulgarian Minister of Finance has lately been in Berlin negotiating the sale of Bulgarian wheat and endeavoring to restore peace among the members of the Bulgarian military mission who are wrangling among themselves and also with the Germans as to the delivery of war materiel in Bulgaria. The Minister of Finance has negotiated the sale of 30,000 tons of surplus wheat which will make room for the present harvest.

774.00/99

Eu:Coe:DG

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 277 Sofia, June 28, 1939.

Subject: Bulgarian Foreign Policy.

774.00
note
740.00

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
JUL 12 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
JUL 28 1939
DIVISION OF
NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1939 JUL 11 AM 10 39
DIVISION OF
COMMUNICATIONS
AND RECORDS

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	M. ID ONI } in confidence

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

JUL 24 1939

774.00/99

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
JUL 18 1939
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AM/G
JUL 22 1939
ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF STATE

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to refer to my despatches Nos. 262, of June 1, 97 and 269, of June 14, 98 and to my telegram No. 36, of June 26, 4 p.m., in which I endeavored to outline considerations weighing with Bulgarian foreign policy and in this connection to report a talk I had with my Yugoslav colleague recently shortly after his return from Belgrade.

662.7431/41 C.F.

FILED
JUL 31 1939

He informed me that the statements appearing here, copied from the Belgrade press, that the Yugoslav Foreign Minister considered that German policy was directed

toward...

GHR

toward obtaining its ends through peace was an understatement of what he had told him. Apparently Mr. Markovitch's impression on his Berlin visit was that Hitler realized a European war would not be a short one and that in the end Germany might well jeopardize not only all she had obtained without bloodshed, but also those advantages Hitler was perfectly convinced he could obtain through creating a series of crises which might eventually decide the democratic powers to negotiate on terms favorable to Germany. My Yugoslav colleague continued that this did not mean that Europe was not still at the mercy of some unforeseen incident very likely involving Poland. It had been pointed out to Prince Paul during his visit to Berlin that the German General Staff war plan envisages an immediate sweep to the southeast through Yugoslavia and Bulgaria to the Aegean, with an Italian Albanian force cooperating against Greece and particularly Salonika before it could be occupied by a British fleet. (The Prime Minister estimates the present Italian military force in Albania, not including aerial or naval units, as between eighty and ninety thousand troops.) This would isolate Rumania and in that case it is doubtful indeed whether she would come into a war at all. Thus, my Yugoslav colleague stated it was explained in Berlin that if Yugoslavia was to ally herself with the democratic powers, her territory must necessarily become the first battleground of Europe. The Yugoslav Minister then stated his country's policy, like that of Bulgaria, lay in maintaining its neutrality, and sentiment in his country was

strongly....

strongly against German domination. He thought it unlikely that Italy's aspirations to play a larger rôle in Bulgaria would lead to any great result.

In my telegram above referred to, I stated that the French had withdrawn their credit and the reasons therefor. In my personal opinion this was somewhat childish in that the credit was due to expire in some weeks anyway, and it was most unlikely that any part of it would have been used, since the premium, as explained in other despatches, was prohibitive. In this particular case of the Westinghouse Air Brake contract the French made an artificially low price to underbid the Germans even at a loss, and the Bulgarians realized that as this was probably only a test incident it was doubtful wisdom to upset their whole economic system based on the German clearing agreement for this single gesture on the part of the French. The Government has not made it known that the French have withdrawn the credit and the French Legation has not published the fact; therefore, the criticism of the French gesture is rather limited. I venture in this connection to question the political advisability of the opening of this and similar credits to Balkan countries, with more special reference to Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. In a despatch written in 1937 I outlined to the Department the views of a very able French group who at that time were urging upon the French and indirectly upon the British as well that they should envisage the formation of a Balkan Commerical Company

with....

with some milliards of francs as capital supplied by the Governments. Such a commercial concern would have brought French and British businessmen into the market places of this and other Near Eastern countries and by their actual purchases of exports on the spot could have obtained such political and economic advantages as would offset Germany and be infinitely more effective and probably not more costly financially than the hit-and-miss policy that England and France have attempted to follow in this part of the world recently.

While my British colleague has never ceased hoping that some part of the British credit may be used, and the Foreign Office informs me the matter is still under consideration, no scheme has yet matured. The British Minister is making various and sundry gestures under the aegis of the British Foreign Publicity Department recently established under Lord Perth. Among these are an offer for a British survey to determine the mineral wealth of the country, scholarships in English universities to brilliant students in Bulgarian highschools, and dissemination of British books, periodicals, etc. etc.; also offers of British teachers on the staffs of institutions of learning whose salaries would be paid by the British Publicity Department. Of course, such a propaganda movement taken in comparison with the propaganda measures of the totalitarian powers is very small, and perhaps carries less weight here because of England's political commitments with the adjoining Balkan states, Rumania, Turkey and Greece.

While....

While sentiment in this country continues intransigent and Bulgaria refuses to join the Balkan Entente without some measure of satisfaction in its territorial aspirations, there seems in the public mind here no defense for the Rumanian Government's tolerating such outrages against a Bulgarian minority, reported in my telegram No. 29, of May 15, noon, or for Gafencu, however definite he may be in his statements of Rumanian policy in Bucharest, gratuitously to sound the tocsin in speeches and remarks he is quoted as having made in Ankara and Athens as to the aims of the Balkan Entente. Very recently Bucharest has raised economic difficulties with Sofia. It seems the Bulgarian Minister of Finance went to Bucharest last autumn and concluded a banking arrangement which to date has worked very satisfactorily, particularly in view of the fact that Bulgarian purchases in Rumania (principally gasoline) outweigh tenfold the value of Rumanian purchases in Bulgaria. Instead of liquidating these payments according to the arrangement made last November, I am informed that Bucharest has now made a demand on the Bulgarian National Bank for an immediate payment of balances due in an amount in foreign exchange which probably the Bulgarian National Bank could not advance at the moment without embarrassments. There is a Bulgarian financial mission now in Bucharest attempting to arrange this question, but the result may well be that Bulgaria will continue to buy her gasoline from Rumania but through German sources and the German clearing agreement, which will only tend to put the

economic...

economic life of this country still further into German hands. In this connection I venture to point out as of interest that a German recently in Sofia said there were between five and six thousand German investigators, engineers and economists in Rumania fostering German interests there.

Meantime, there are reports of friendly overtures made by Hungary and the conclusion of a Hungarian-Bulgarian cultural pact, and last week General Fischer, special aide to Admiral Horthy, arrived in this country on a visit, carrying a high Hungarian decoration for the King with whom he had an extended interview as well as with the Prime Minister.

In my telegram of today's date I referred to a conversation with the Prime Minister in which he reported his forthcoming visit to Berlin and referred to the economic matters between the two countries. Mr. Bojiloff, the Minister of Finance, is in Berlin at the moment negotiating the sale of Bulgarian wheat and restoring accord among the members of the Bulgarian military mission who are not only in dispute among themselves, but also with the Germans as to the delivery of war materiel on order to this country. I understand the Germans are willing to make immediate delivery of Czech materiel without political commitments, but desire an extension of time for new war materiel in view of the large German orders that must have precedence. It is on this point, I understand, that there is lack of agreement. On the other hand,

Mr...

Mr. Bojiloff has negotiated the sale of thirty thousand tons of surplus wheat, to make room for the present harvest, at an approximate price of 3.80 leva per kilogram, and at the same time obtained as an added sweetening German agreement to pay 3 per cent interest on the blocked marks account held for Bulgaria in Germany. It is interesting in this connection to note that Italy is in competition with Germany for Bulgarian wheat, but the Bulgarian financial mission which is now in Rome under Dr. Watchoff, head of the Commercial Section of the Foreign Office, is having hard sledding and has twice come near breaking off negotiations owing to Italian intransigeance. I understand the Italian offer with premium for wheat works out only at little more than 2 leva as compared with the German offer of 3.80 leva mentioned above, and that the military supplies consisting mostly of cloth for uniforms works out at a very high figure in comparison with what it may be bought elsewhere.

I am informed that the Bulgarian War Office had hoped to have this new war materiel and uniform cloth available in this country at an early date, since two classes of infantry have been called up for training and manoeuvres during the month of August and it was hoped these might be available.

The Foreign Minister of Egypt on completion of his visit to Bucharest will stop in Sofia next week en route to Cairo. This visit together with the fact that the Argentines have recently opened a Legation office here under a Chargé d'Affaires as separate from the

Argentine...

Argentine Consulate General, and that a Japanese diplomatic officer is allegedly to be assigned shortly to this country, has somewhat restored a feeling of self-importance in Sofia.

Respectfully yours,

Gay Atherton

X

File 710/800
RA/MM

4 Carbon Copies
Received --W.V.A.--

CROSS-REFERENCE FILE

NOTE

SUBJECT Bulgaria determined to maintain its political and economic independence and intends to remain neutral in case of a general war.

774.00/100

For the original paper from which reference is taken

See Des. #652
(Despatch, telegram, instruction, letter, etc.)

Dated July 13, 1939 From / To Yugoslavia (Byington)

GMB

File No. 760h.74/409

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1—1540

mb

January 10, 1940.

Summary of Despatch no. 370 from
Legation at Sofia, dated December 6, 1939.

Subject: Bulgaria's Foreign Policy.

Bulgaria's position vis-a-vis the four Great Powers which principally influence the country is as follows:

1. Germany's position, formerly predominant politically before Russia occupied the Polish Ukraine, is now essentially economic. Bulgaria is eager to have high prices paid for her agricultural products and Germany is still Bulgaria's only source for the obtaining of arms which are being supplied on advantageous long-term credits. Bulgaria, however, has not forgotten her war experiences with a powerful and hungry ally.

2. Great Britain became very unpopular last summer as she was blamed for the concentration of Turkish troops in Thrace. However, the Ankara Pact has given England a strong if indirect influence on Bulgaria.

3. Italy has recently asserted herself as a Balkan power in definite opposition to Russia and any move by the latter would

presumably

presumably tend to increase the apparently growing Italo-British cooperation in the Balkans. The Prime Minister of Bulgaria has shown a favorable interest in Italy's reassumption of a leading role in the Balkans. This, Mr. Millard interprets as welcoming Italy as a further counter-weight to Russia.

4. Russia ~~affords~~ exerts the most important single influence on Bulgaria. It is not only the nearest great power, but for historical, racial, and cultural reasons is the only one which is widely revered in Bulgaria. (Mr. Millard, however, forgets to mention the still latent distrust of F Russia for her skullduggery in connection with the removal from power of Prince Alexander of Battenberg in the 1880's.) Apparently Mr. Kiosseivanoff does not regard as an immediate possibility a Russian move on the Straits. It would appear that Russia had lost a friend in Turkey and that she now seeks the friendship of Bulgaria as a check on that lost friend.

The fact that the above-mentioned four Great Powers are interested in Bulgaria's destiny is pleasing to the Bulgarian Government as this rivalry gives Bulgaria a field in which to maneuver. The Prime

Minister

Minister has talked about the balance of power which is so essential for the continued existence of Bulgaria and the counter-influences of the powers give/ an elastic quantity to Bulgaria's international affairs. However should the situation change, by a Russian move or some other event, standing as she does at the crossroads of the Balkans, there would be a great danger of Bulgaria being turned into a battlefield.

Eu:Ce :EJD

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS

January 10, 1940.

Summary of Despatch no. 370 from
Legation at Sofia, dated December 6, 1939.

Subject: Bulgaria's Foreign Policy.

Bulgaria's position vis-a-vis the four Great Powers which principally influence the country is as follows:

1. Germany's position, formerly predominant politically before Russia occupied the Polish Ukraine, is now essentially economic. Bulgaria is eager to have high prices paid for her agricultural products and Germany is still Bulgaria's only source for the obtaining of arms which are being supplied on advantageous long-term credits. Bulgaria, however, has not forgotten her war experiences with a powerful and hungry ally.

2. Great Britain became very unpopular last summer as she was blamed for the concentration of Turkish troops in Thrace. However, the Ankara Pact has given England a strong if indirect influence on Bulgaria.

3. Italy has recently asserted herself as a Balkan power in definite opposition to Russia and any move by the latter would

presumably

presumably tend to increase the apparently growing Italo-British cooperation in the Balkans. The Prime Minister of Bulgaria has shown a favorable interest in Italy's reassumption of a leading role in the Balkans. This, Mr. Millard interprets as welcoming Italy as a further counter-weight to Russia.

4. Russia ~~efforts~~ experts the most important single influence on Bulgaria. It is not only the nearest great power, but for historical, racial, and cultural reasons is the only one which is widely revered in Bulgaria. (Mr. Millard, however, forgets to mention the still latent distrust of Russia for her skullduggery in connection with the removal from power of Prince Alexander of Battenberg in the 1880's.) Apparently Mr. Kiosseivanoff does not regard as an immediate possibility a Russian move on the Straits. It would appear that Russia had lost a friend in Turkey and that she now seeks the friendship of Bulgaria as a check on that lost friend.

The fact that the above-mentioned four Great Powers are interested in Bulgaria's destiny is pleasing to the Bulgarian Government as this rivalry gives Bulgaria a field in which to maneuver. The Prime

Minister

Minister has talked about the balance of power which is so essential for the continued existence of Bulgaria, and the counter-influences of the powers gives an elastic quality to Bulgaria's international affairs. However should the situation change, by a Russian move or some other event, standing as she does at the crossroads of the Balkans, there would be a great danger of Bulgaria being turned into a battlefield.

Eu:Cœ :EJD

LEGATION OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

No. 370

Sofia, December 6, 1939.

EU
PA
AMC

Subject: Bulgaria's foreign policy.

copy in Eu

DIVISION OF EUROPEAN AFFAIRS
JAN 4 1940
File Cor
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

774.00

Rating	Distribution Instructions
Grade for	MID ONI in confidence

JAN 23 1940

RECEIVED
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
1940 JAN 3 AM 10 35

DIVISION OF COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS

ADVISER ON POLITICAL RELATIONS
MR. DUNN
JAN 13 1940
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

774.00/101

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
A-M/C
JAN 23 1940
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

FILED
JAN 30 1940

The Honorable

The Secretary of State,

Washington.

Sir:

I have the honor to submit the following as background of the present Bulgarian foreign policy.

As explained in some detail in my despatch No. 358, of November 4, the Bulgarian Prime Minister believes that small nations depend for their existence on the balance of power among great nations. Bulgaria's position vis-à-vis the four Great Powers which principally influence this country -- Germany, Great Britain, Italy and Russia -- is briefly as follows:

GRR

1. ...

1. Germany's position in Bulgaria, which was predominant until Russian troops occupied the Polish Ukraine, is now essentially economic. Bulgaria is pleased with the good prices Germany pays for agricultural produce and Germany is still Bulgaria's only source of arms which are being supplied, as previously reported, on advantageous long-term credits. At the same time Bulgaria remembers most unpleasantly her war experiences with a powerful and hungry ally. In my telegram No. 81, of November 27, 6 p.m. I quoted the Prime Minister's statement that Germany "has no political aspirations" in the Balkans. While I would hesitate in subscribing to that statement, it is true that Bulgaria no longer fears Germany which has lost the whip hand in this country and exerts only discreet political influence, and cannot openly oppose Russia.

2. Great Britain has until very recently done nothing at all about or for Bulgaria and became extremely unpopular last summer when they earned, rightly or wrongly, a large measure of opprobrium for the concentrations in Thrace of the troops of her Turkish ally (see despatch No. 324, of September 4). Though the recent withdrawal of these troops, reported in telegram No. 79, of November 11, has done something to improve Britain's standing with King Boris and the Prime Minister and, to a small degree, with Bulgarian public opinion, accessability and power are what really matter, and the Ankara Pact has given Great Britain a strong if indirect influence on Bulgaria. Nevertheless, Bulgaria does not at present fear aggression from the Allies and the Bulgarian Government appears to have Britain's good offices insofar as Turkey is concerned, provided Bulgaria does not ask for a territorial outlet to the Aegean.

3. ...

3. Italy has recently asserted herself as a Balkan power and in definite opposition to Russia; and any move by Russia would presumably tend to increase the apparently growing Italo-British cooperation in the Balkans. It will be recalled that the Prime Minister displayed a favorable interest in Italy's recent reassumption of a leading rôle in the Balkans which I interpreted as welcoming Italy as a further counterweight to Russia (see above-mentioned telegram No. 81, of November 27). I think, however, the reference to Italy's taking the position which Austria-Hungary formerly held in this respect is an exaggeration and wishful thinking on Mr. Kiosseivanoff's part.

4. Russia is not only the nearest great power, but for historical reasons and, to a lesser extent, for racial and cultural reasons, is the only one which is widely revered in this country. For these and other reasons Russia exerts the most important single influence on Bulgaria; but it is extremely difficult to weigh this influence, since it depends on so many unknown quantities, such as, will Russia take Bessarabia, without opposition or with opposition; and if so, with Anglo-Turkish, Italian, or even German opposition ? If Russia is successful in taking Bessarabia, will she continue to push towards the Straits ? Though the British Legation professes to be much concerned on this score, the Prime Minister does not regard this as an immediate possibility. Thus, until something is known of Russia's intentions and capabilities, it is difficult to evaluate her influence on Bulgaria. In any event, Russia has apparently lost a friend in Turkey and now seeks the friendship of Bulgaria as a check on that lost friend. As to Communism, the Bulgarian Minister to Russia tells me that Moscow knows that Communism cannot exist in

one...

one Balkan country alone and that its introduction into Bulgaria would be the signal for this country's invasion by her neighbors backed by the Allies and perhaps Italy. Mr. Antonoff thinks that Russia will never permit her missionary interests to interfere with her political aspirations. Certainly the Prime Minister does not seem impressed by the British Minister's harping on the danger of Communism.

But leaving guesses aside, the mere fact that the above-mentioned four Great Powers are interested in Bulgaria's destiny is in itself welcome to the Bulgarian Government, as this rivalry gives this country a field in which to maneuver. The fact that two of these great powers are belligerents and two are neutrals and that there appears to be no full agreement between any two of them, though there is some small understanding on minor points, lends to these influences an elastic quality conducive to that very balance of power which the Prime Minister deems essential to the existence of Bulgaria, and accounts for the relative and restrained optimism which he now displays.

So long as the present equilibrium among the Great Powers is not disturbed, Bulgaria's position is not likely to be altered, but may even be strengthened. If, however, this state of affairs in the Balkans should be changed through some action of a great power, Soviet Russia, for example, it might entail a corresponding reaction on the part of the other interested powers and result in Bulgaria being forced into war. Occupying as she does the central position in the Balkans and being at the crossroads of the strong political influences and interests of the Great Powers, there would be a danger of this country being turned into a battlefield. Thus,

it....

it would seem that the welfare of Bulgaria depends largely on the maintenance of the present balance of power.

Respectfully yours,

Hugh L. Millard

Hugh Millard
Chargé d'Affaires a.i.

File 710
HM/MM

4 carbon copies
Received

Central File: Decimal File 774.00, Political Relations Of States, Relations; Bi-Lateral Treaties., Bulgaria And The World, April 29, 1930 - January 10, 1940. April 29, 1930 - January 10, 1940. MS Turkey, Greece, and the Balkan States: Records of the U.S. Department of State, 1930-1944: Records of the Department of State Relating to Political Relations of Turkey, Greece, and the Balkan States, 1930-1939. National Archives (United States). Archives Unbound, link.gale.com%2Fapps%2Fdoc%2FSC5111390565%2FGDSC%3Fu%3Domni%26sid%3Dbookmark-GDSC. Accessed 21 June 2025.